

MSA SC 5881-1-250



MARYLAND
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

BOARD OF EDITORS

DR. RHODA M. DORSEY, *Chairman*

DR. JACK P. GREENE

DR. AUBREY C. LAND

DR. BENJAMIN QUARLES

DR. MORRIS L. RADOFF

MR. A. RUSSELL SLAGLE

DR. RICHARD WALSH

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. 63, No. 2 JUNE, 1968

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Greenbelt, Maryland: A City on a Hill <i>Leslie Gene Hunter</i>	105
Priest Neale and His Successors <i>John W. McGrain, Jr.</i>	137
Frank R. Kent's Opposition to Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal <i>Eugene W. Goll</i>	158
Sidelights <i>Edited by Richard K. MacMaster</i>	172
Instructions to a Tobacco Factor, 1725	
Bibliographical Notes, <i>Edited by Edward G. Howard</i>	179
Not in Semmes IV by Bernard de Bruyn	
Reviews of Recent Books	190
Tindall, <i>The Emergence of the New South</i> , by Henry H. Simms	
Smith, <i>The Death of Slavery: The United States, 1837-65</i> , by Howard H. Bell	
Halasz, <i>The Rattling Chains, Slave Unrest and Revolt in the Antebellum South</i> , by W. Harrison Daniel	
Abbott, <i>The Freedmen's Bureau in South Carolina, 1865-1872</i> , by James I. Robertson, Jr.	
Slagle, <i>The Slagle Family in America, Descended from The Schlegel von Gottleben Family of Germany</i> , by P. W. Filby	
Sefton, <i>The United States Army and Reconstruction, 1865-1877</i> , by Robert H. Jones	
Wynes, <i>Forgotten Voices: Dissenting Southerners in an Age of Conformity</i> , by Harry M. Ward	
Evans, <i>Ballots and Fence Rails: Reconstruction on the Lower Cape Fear</i> , by Richard R. Duncan	
Gray, <i>The National Waterway: A History of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, 1769-1965</i> , by Charles W. Turner	
Main, <i>The Upper House in Revolutionary America, 1763-1788</i> , by Robert M. Calhoon	
Books Received	203
Notes and Queries	205
Contributors	206
Annual Report	208

Annual Subscription to the Magazine, \$5.00. Each issue \$1.25. The Magazine assumes no responsibility for statements or opinions expressed in its pages.

Richard R. Duncan, *Editor*
Nancy Faass, *Assistant to the Editor*

Published quarterly by the Maryland Historical Society, 201 W. Monument Street, Baltimore, Md. Second-Class postage paid at Baltimore, Md.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

A Quarterly

Volume 63

JUNE, 1968

Number 2

GREENBELT, MARYLAND: A CITY ON A HILL

By LESLIE GENE HUNTER

IN a cover story for its March 4, 1966 issue, *Time* magazine focused its attention on the need for urban planning and editorialized that: "In 1966, 67% of the nation's population is jammed into 9% of its acreage . . . by A.D. 2000, 80% of all Americans—more than today's entire population—will be city dwellers."¹ Reflecting this concern, the recent establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development has further underscored the priority of urban problems. But interest in such planning by the federal government was actually foreshadowed by the New Deal Resettlement Administration project, Greenbelt, Maryland, in the 1930's.

Some of the impulses which went into this project had a history going back several decades before the New Deal. An

¹ *Time*, March 4, 1966.

English intellectual, Sir Ebenezer Howard, planned a number of Garden Cities in the nineteenth century as a solution for the chaotic, unattractive and unhealthy metropolises. His model towns of Letchworth and Welwyn inspired a number of young American architects and town planners, who built the Garden City of Radburn, New Jersey, and who were later involved in designing the Greenbelt towns. In the first three decades of this century a number of groups sponsored Garden Cities and back-to-the-land movements to solve urban problems by resettling men in planned communities and in a rural environment. The back-to-the-land movement gained momentum in the depression, and the Senate advised the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish information to the destitute who were anxious to return to the country.²

Franklin D. Roosevelt held a number of notions similar to those of the back-to-the-landers. His uncle, Frederick A. Delano, was deeply involved in municipal improvement programs, and Roosevelt later recalled that he became interested in urban planning in 1912 following a conversation with his uncle. He was not interested in the "mere planning of a single city but in the larger aspects of planning. It is the way of the future."³ In 1911 the future president indicated that the political hope of the country rested with the rural folk who had more time for meditation and who had a courageous conviction for their conclusions.⁴

It was possible, Governor Franklin Roosevelt wrote, to arrange a better distribution of population between the large metropolises and the small rural towns. It was not necessary to keep the workers in the "shadow of the factory" because electric power meant that industry could decentralize, and

² Ebenezer Howard, *Garden Cities of To-Morrow* (London, 1945), pp. 33-9; Clarence S. Stein, *Toward New Towns for America* (New York, 1957), pp. 11-7; Paul Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World: The New Deal Community Program* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1959), pp. 15-30, 68-70; U.S. Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, *Information as an Aid to Unemployed Who Seek Opportunities in Rural Areas*, Report No. 799, 72nd Congress, 1st Session, 1932.

³ Rexford G. Tugwell, *The Democratic Roosevelt: A Biography of Franklin D. Roosevelt* (Garden City, 1957), p. 45; Rexford G. Tugwell, "The Sources of New Deal Reformism," *Ethics*, Vol. 64 (July, 1954), pp. 268-274; Franklin Roosevelt, "Growing Up by Plan," *Survey*, Vol. 67 (Feb. 1, 1932), p. 483; Frederick A. Delano, "To Meet the Housing Needs of the Lower Income Groups," *American City*, Vol. 52 (Jan., 1937), pp. 45-48.

⁴ *New York Globe*, Feb. 6, 1911, quoted in Tugwell, "The Sources of New Deal Reformism," pp. 274-275.

locate in rural areas, which held innumerable advantages over an urban environment. In 1931 he informed the American Country Life Conference that he desired to alleviate the plight of the distressed who were concentrated in the cities. Because of modern transportation the rural resident could not only enjoy the fruits of urban culture but also a more "natural community life." He established a commission to investigate and plan for establishing "wholly new rural communities of homes for workers."⁵

In *Looking Forward*, Roosevelt announced that he was interested in an alternative which was intermediary between urban and rural living—a "rural-industrial group." The tone of the President's pronouncements were far from the rapturous, utopian rhetoric used by some of his subordinates. One of the "brains trust" pointed out that Herbert Hoover had a clearer notion of the "city's essence, its beautiful organic possibilities" than Roosevelt. One scholar's comment that Roosevelt thought of his urban housing program more in terms of reviving the building trades quite correctly indicates the man's more pragmatic approach. This can be extended to some extent to the resettlement projects, about which he was a great deal more enthusiastic.⁶

In his first Inaugural Address, Roosevelt announced:

Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time, through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and recognize the use of our natural resources.

⁵ Although the Commission seemed strikingly like the later Resettlement Administration, this does not mean that he entered office with a full blown plan for resettlement. It does mean that he held a number of predilections which eventually logically evolved into the Resettlement Administration. Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Back to the Land," *Review of Reviews*, Vol. 84 (Oct., 1931), pp. 63-64; Franklin D. Roosevelt, "A New Rural Planning," *Rural Government: Proceedings of the Fourteenth American Country Life Conference* (Chicago, 1932), pp. 10-17.

⁶ Hoover had issued, while he was Secretary of Commerce, the first model city planning law to guide local government.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, *Looking Forward* (New York, 1933), pp. 56-57; Tugwell, "The Sources of New Deal Reformism," pp. 267-268; William E. Leuchtenburg, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, 1932-1940* (New York, 1963), pp. 134-135.

Hand in hand with this we must frankly recognize the overbalance of population in our industrial centers, and, by engaging on a national scale in a redistribution, endeavor to provide a better use of the land.⁷

A number of early attempts were made to implement these ideas. Congress allowed \$25 million of the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) to help resettle rural and urban populations. A division of Subsistence Homesteads was established in the Department of Agriculture under the Federal Emergency Relief Act (FERA). The director of FERA established by executive order a Division of Rural Rehabilitation and Stranded Populations. The Public Works Administration (PWA) established a Scientific Advisory Board which set up a Land Use committee. The Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) had a Land Policy section, and the Surplus Relief Corporation (SRC) worked in the area of land use.⁸

The diverse agencies dealing with a more rational use of land and distribution of population were coordinated in 1935 by a series of executive orders which brought them together in a new agency—the Resettlement Administration (RA). To head the RA Roosevelt appointed Columbia University economic professor Rexford Guy Tugwell who shared with Roosevelt a deep interest in rural life and in whom Roosevelt (according to Tugwell) felt that he had found a kindred spirit.⁹

Tugwell was an extremely prolific young intellectual who had been deeply impressed by Thornstein Veblen's ideas. He held collectivist views and believed that the old individ-

⁷ Samuel I. Rosenman (ed.), *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin Roosevelt* (New York, 1938-1950), II, p. 13.

⁸ Florence E. Parker, "Labor Under the Farm Security Program," *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 53 (Dec., 1941), pp. 1368-1369; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, pp. 87-94, 131-134; Bernard Sternsher, *Rexford Tugwell and the New Deal* (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1964), p. 263.

⁹ A series of other agencies were subsequently transferred to the Resettlement Administration. Executive Order 7072, Sept. 30, 1935, Executive Order 7028, Sept. 30, 1935, Executive Order 7041, May 15, 1935, and Executive Order 7200, Sept. 26, 1935, U.S. House of Representatives, Select Committee of the House Committee on Agriculture, *Hearings to Investigate the Activities of the Farm Security Administration*, 78th Cong., 1st Sess., 1943, pp. 10-23, 966-969; U.S. House of Representatives, Agriculture Committee, *Investigating the Activities of the Farm Security Administration*, Report No. 1430, 78th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1944, pp. 52-55; "Emergency and Experimental New Deal Legislation Expiring this Year," *Congressional Digest*, Vol. 16 (Jan., 1937), pp. 6-8; Sternsher, *Rexford Tugwell and the New Deal*, pp. 264-265; Rexford Tugwell, "The Preparation of a President," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 1 (June, 1948), pp. 133-135.

Rexford Guy Tugwell, 1891-



ualistic capitalism and rampant exploitation was archaic and responsible for the disastrous imbalances that the world was then experiencing. He bitterly assailed the orthodoxies and announced that the method to correct the ills and to prevent their recurrence was a collectivistic and rationally planned economy. He was sickened by the misery, squalor and unemployment in large cities, and distressed by the depleted natural resources, ravished, exploited and virtually destroyed by the selfish, individualistic system of land ownership. The economic system had to be treated as a planned and regulated whole for the benefit and indeed for the very survival of the community. In 1935, he wondered "if our next great spirit of common endeavor will not be to see America rehoused."¹⁰

¹⁰ Rexford Tugwell, "After the New Deal," *New Republic*, Vol. 99 (July 26, 1939), pp. 323-325; Rexford Tugwell, "Down to Earth," *Current History*, Vol. 44 (July, 1936), pp. 33-38; Rexford Tugwell, "The Real Estate Dilemma," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 2 (Nov. 1, 1942), pp. 27-29; Rexford Tugwell, *The Battle for Democracy* (New York, 1935), p. 67; Rexford Tugwell, "Our New National Domain," *Scribner's Magazine*, Vol. 99 (March, 1936); Rexford Tugwell, "Changing Acres," *Current History*, Vol. 44 (Sept., 1936), pp. 59-63; Tugwell, "The Sources of New Deal Reformism," pp. 251-255; Mariner Eccles, *Beckoning Frontiers* (New York, 1951), p. 114; Sternsher, *Rexford Tugwell and the New Deal*, pp. 12-25, 92-111, 132, 140, 195.

Professor Tugwell was in many ways an unfortunate choice for the directorship of the RA. He was greatly vilified and his public image was a distorted parody of reality. A newspaper editor warned parents not to allow their children to read his books, and a number of Congressmen were decidedly hostile. The vociferous attack upon the man further weakened the program of the RA and what possibilities there were for the success of Greenbelt.¹¹

Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, noted in his diary that Tugwell was indiscreet in his announcements. Tugwell had written a pompous poem in his youth announcing that he would roll up his sleeves, "bend the forces untamable," "harness the powers irresistible," and "make America over." He told an audience that they should be indignant enough to form ranks and "execute a concerted attack on well-stocked Tory citadels." They were witnessing the "death struggle of industrial autocracy." The autocrats had to be removed from power but without bloodshed.¹² The foes of Greenbelt had plenty of ammunition.

He was attacked as a Communist. He was accused of using Roosevelt as a Kerensky, while he ultimately would emerge as the American Lenin. He had made a trip to Russia in 1927 which was never forgotten. Although the Greenbelt towns were only a small part of the RA, they were singled out for the most vigorous attack. If the vilification were not enough, his programs were attacked by the courts and the construction of one of the Greenbelt towns was thwarted.¹³

¹¹ Prior to his appointment to the RA, he was nominated for the position of Undersecretary of Agriculture. Only after he had been denounced and rigorously grilled by a Senate hearing, and after Mr. Farley had been "put to work," was his nomination approved.

Russell Lord, *The Wallaces of Iowa* (Boston, 1947), pp. 345-347, 459; Sternsher, *Rexford Tugwell and the New Deal*, pp. vii, 223-250, 252-258; Rexford Tugwell, "The Compromising Roosevelt," *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 6 (June, 1953), pp. 330; Harold L. Ickes, *The Secret Diary of Harold L. Ickes: The First Thousand Days, 1933-1936* (New York, 1953), I, pp. 164, 474.

¹² Rexford Tugwell, "The Progressive Task Today and Tomorrow," *Vital Speeches*, Vol. 2 (Dec. 2, 1935), pp. 130-135; Sternsher, *Rexford Tugwell and the New Deal*, p. 5.

The poem was quoted by hostile Senators and in numerous articles. See for example: "Tugwell's Dream," *Newsweek*, Vol. 28 (July 1, 1946), p. 26; *Hearings to Investigate . . . the Farm Security Administration*, pp. 1866-1870.

¹³ Alva Johnston, "Tugwell, the President's Idea Man," *Saturday Evening Post*, Vol. 209 (Aug. 1, 1936), p. 8; Blair Bolles, "The Sweetheart of the Regimenters," *The American Mercury*, Vol. 39 (Sept., 1936), pp. 80-81; *New York Times*,

His agency never received Congressional sanction. Of the young men who flocked to Washington, old-time politicians especially disliked the cold and rather arrogant intellectual from Columbia. He had no administrative experience, and there was no reason to assume that he could coordinate and direct diverse multi-million dollar programs. By training, background, education and temperament he was not the best choice Roosevelt could have made. Putting Tugwell in charge of the RA, one critic wrote, was "like putting Typhoid Mary in charge of the Public Health Service."¹⁴ This *bon mot* contains a certain amount of truth.

One observer noted that Tugwell and his followers had an *élan* to reconstruct the United States. Eventually it became evident that they were working in a vacuum; "The conspirators had neglected to take the American people into their confidence." The bitter Veblenian rhetoric and the sophisticated intellectual conceptions made for a lack of communication between the RA and the public, and indeed left the agency open to attack. Years later, Tugwell remained unrepentant and advised planners that they must pursue their solutions to urban problems "singlemindedly even if in advance of majority consent to the particular instruments" they chose to employ.¹⁵

By 1936, Tugwell was a political liability and the adminis-

Sept. 21, 1936; Broadus Mitchell, *Depression Decade: From New Era Through New Deal* (Vol. 9, "The Economic History of the United States," New York, 1947), p. 217; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, pp. 161-174.

For the size of the Suburban Resettlement Division compared to the overall Resettlement, see: Resettlement Administration, *First Annual Report of the Resettlement Administration* (1936), p. 73; "Work of the Resettlement Administration, 1935-1936," *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 44 (March, 1937), p. 620; Sternsher, *Rexford Tugwell and the New Deal*, pp. 268-277; *Hearings to Investigate . . . Farm Security Administration*, pp. 1030, 1118.

¹⁴ Sternsher, *Rexford Tugwell and the New Deal*, p. 217; Lord, *The Wallaces of Iowa*, pp. 351-357; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, pp. 176-177; *Secret Diary of Harold L. Ickes*, p. 410; Johnston, "Tugwell, the President's Idea Man," p. 9.

¹⁵ Over two decades after he left the New Deal he advised young administrators to be certain when they attacked social ills, that they were riding the crest of a popular movement. If they did not have, however, the backing of a powerful and articulate political bloc, they should proceed anyway and fail as gloriously as their predecessors. "You will have the satisfaction, which is not to be discounted, of having annoyed a good many miscreants who had it coming to them."

Rexford Tugwell, "The Resettlement Idea," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 33 (Oct., 1959), pp. 163-164; Tugwell, "The Real Estate Dilemma," p. 28; Marquis W. Childs, *I Write From Washington* (New York, 1942), pp. 12-14.

tration knew it. Jim Farley, Postmaster General and political oracle in this year, believed that the WPA and Tugwell would be the two major points of Republican attack in the upcoming election. When he told the President that Harry Hopkins, controversial head of the FERA, and Rex Tugwell ought to be kept out of the campaign and permitted to make no speeches, Roosevelt replied: "I agree thoroughly . . . I'm going to take steps to eliminate criticism in the future." Rexford Tugwell politely tendered his resignation effective at the end of the year.¹⁶

Before he resigned, however, the Resettlement Administration had undertaken a number of projects, and the plans for the city on the hill had been made. The Resettlement Administration, and others, had been swamped with a number of crackpot schemes. One man wanted to reinvigorate the lethargic blood stream of Southerners by importing Quakers. A dancing instructor proposed that Greek robes and instruction in aesthetic dances be provided for crude and heavy-footed farmers. A California eccentric proposed that gigantic dairy barns to house 2,000 cows be built. His plans called for an electric fly killer at the roof of the barn and a chain of buckets to carry the corpses of the executed insects to the manure spreader. The electricity to run the machinery would be provided by twenty-four bulls walking on power-producing treadmills.¹⁷

The scheme which Tugwell hatched seemed to his critics to be equally strange. His staff was housed in the fifty-four room

¹⁶ After Tugwell's resignation his only connection with Greenbelt was some years later when he was a resident of Greenbelt and a member of the Board of Directors in the Savings and Loan Association which was trying to help refinance the resale of the cooperative homes.

The Secret Diary of Harold L. Ickes, p. 580; *New York Times*, March 31, 1936; James A. Farley, *Jim Farley's Story* (New York, 1948), p. 57; Tugwell, *The Democratic Roosevelt*, pp. 414, 547; Tugwell, "The Resettlement Idea," p. 163; Sternsher, *Rexford Tugwell and the New Deal*, p. 304; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt, 1937-1962*, p. 34.

On the day his resignation was effective, the Resettlement Administration was transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Its name was later changed, and it was restricted from undertaking any new projects. And the Greenbelt towns were booted from agency to agency until they were finally liquidated.

Executive Order 7530, Dec. 31, 1936, Executive Order 9070, Feb. 24, 1942, *House Report No. 1430*, pp. 55-59; U.S. House of Representatives, Agriculture Committee, *Farm Security Act of 1937*, Report No. 586, 75th Cong., 1st Sess., 1937, pp. 2-9; U.S. House of Representatives, Agriculture Committee, *Farm Security Act of 1937*, Report No. 1065, 75th Cong., 1st Sess., 1937, p. 9; *Hearing to Investigate . . . the Farm Security Administration*, pp. 971, 1138.

¹⁷ Conklin, *Tomorrow A New World*, pp. 99-100; Russell Lord, "The Rebirth of Rural Life," *Survey Graphic*, Vol. 30 (Dec., 1941), p. 690.

Walsh mansion. Halfway up the grand marble stairway was a massive piece of sculpture. The high ceilings were decorated with saccharine frescoes, and the walls had to be covered to protect the brocade. Desks were set up in what had been the mistress' boudoir, beneath a mural of little angels singing. In these heady surroundings the planners drafted plans for Greenbelt, Maryland. One observer noted that the planners seemed like a "party of happy picknickers" who had been "allowed to camp for a time of the halls of the rich and mighty." A distinguished architectural consultant noted that the young designers thought of residential housing in terms of tailor-made mansions. Some of their first sketches looked like "Westchester villas" of young bankers.¹⁸ Greenbelt to be sure would be like no other city in the United States.

The RA was charged with building rural and suburban communities in which destitute and low income families could be resettled. The Greenbelt project had three official goals—employing relief workers, demonstrating the soundness of town planning, and providing low rent housing—which complicated an evaluation of the city because these goals were variously interpreted.¹⁹

The architects wanted to build the best of possible cities, planned as an aesthetic whole. One of the designers dreamed that it would preserve "eye to eye democracy" and the old New England village heritage. President Roosevelt was less utopian and desired to put men to work constructing houses for low income families in pleasant rural environments. Director Tugwell wanted to show the potentialities of social planning and the inadequacies of housing built by private enterprise. A Senator believed that the project would prime the "business pump" and incidentally provide new, badly needed housing. At times the RA bureaucrats emphasized that it was a demon-

¹⁸ "Alphabet Soup in a Washington Mansion," *Literary Digest*, Vol. 120 (Aug. 31, 1935), pp. 10-11; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, p. 120; Childs, *I Write From Washington*, pp. 10-13.

¹⁹ *Hearings to Investigate . . . the Farm Security Administration*, p. 966; "Establishment of Federal Resettlement Administration," *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 41 (Aug., 1935), p. 348; *New York Times*, May 2, 1935; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, pp. 118-120; Parker, "Labor Under the Farm Security Program," p. 1374; Henry S. Churchill, "America's Town Planning Begins," *New Republic*, Vol. 87 (June 3, 1936), p. 87; "Greenbelt Towns," *Architectural Record*, Vol. 80 (Sept., 1936), p. 216.

stration of new town planning; on other occasions they reported that the project had been undertaken primarily to provide relief work. On a single page of an RA report the towns were proclaimed as "charting the course for modern town planning," and a few lines later it was announced that "the purpose of this program was to provide useful employment for relief labor in the construction of communities in suburban areas."²⁰

An incredibly complex system of accounting developed in which various items were "written off" the costs of the project on the basis of different objectives. One hostile critic perceived the extreme difficulty in this mathematical morass of determining the success of Greenbelt. In a fictitious dialogue between an administrator and a taxpayer, she portrayed the taxpayer as complaining that it was not very efficient relief because the government was spending millions of dollars to aid only a handful of people. The New Dealer replied that it was only partially relief, it was really a demonstration model community. When the taxpayer wondered how it could be a model if it housed only the lowest income group, the administrator answered that it was relief for the lower income group. If it was relief, the taxpayer persisted, it was extremely inadequate because it would house only a few families. The New Dealer replied that it was a demonstration. When the taxpayer inquired what type of a demonstration cost two to three times what was necessary, he was told that it was relief.²¹ Although there were some fallacies in this dialogue, it brilliantly illuminated the most difficult dialectic which occurred in trying to evaluate Greenbelt, Maryland.

The Resettlement Administration assembled a large number

²⁰ "Housing Under the Resettlement Administration," *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 44 (June, 1937), p. 1387; Senator Robert F. Wagner, "Should the Administration's Housing Policy be Continued?" *Congressional Digest*, Vol. 15 (April, 1936), pp. 112-113; Resettlement Administration, *Report of the Administrator of the Resettlement Administration, 1937*, p. 17; Farm Security Administration, *Toward Farm Security* (1941), pp. 86-87; U. S. House of Representatives, Appropriations Committee, *Hearings on the Agriculture Department Appropriations Bill for 1943*, Part 2, 77th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1942, p. 236; U. S. Senate, Banking and Currency Committee, *Hearings on S. 351. Sale of Greentown Suburban Resettlement projects*, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., 1949, pp. 75-76; Rexford Tugwell, "Should the Administration's Housing Policy be Continued?" *Congressional Digest*, Vol. 15 (April, 1936), pp. 114-116; *First Annual Report of the Resettlement Administration*, p. 43.

²¹ Johnston, "Tugwell, The President's Idea Man," p. 73.

of experts who studied the growth of 100 cities, the proportion of the population in manufacturing, the wage scales, labor policies, the local government, and the housing needs. They narrowed the field to those locations where industrial and land values did not fluctuate radically, and where there was a good wage scale and a diversity of industry. The RA was assisted by labor unions in distributing thousands of questionnaires to evaluate what the local populace wanted in a house.²²

Each of the Greenbelt towns had a separate staff. But before the research was completed, construction began on Greenbelt under the urgency of providing relief work. The titles to several parcels of land, many of which were held by original grants from Lord Baltimore, were quickly optioned. The site was chosen because of the availability of the land and it adjoined the National Agriculture Research Center whose employees perhaps could be housed in Greenbelt. The topography was perfect for economical planning, and Washington had a rapid population growth, lacked adequate housing, and its rent rates were 30 per cent higher than cities of comparable size. There are various statistics on how many acres were purchased. Regardless of how many acres were purchased, the land was inexpensive because it had been exhausted by tobacco farming and cost \$91.73, \$94, \$97 or \$98 per acre (depending upon the statistic chosen).²³

Assuming that 12,259 acres were purchased, 8,659 of this were turned over to the Research Center. Of the 3,600 acres remaining, 217 were used for the town itself, 500 for future expansion, 250 for parks, 107 for allotment gardens, twenty for a county high school, and the rest was left undeveloped for parks and recreation.²⁴

²² Churchill, "America's Town Planning Begins," p. 96; "Greenbelt Towns," pp. 216-219; *First Annual Report of the Resettlement Administrator*, p. 43.

²³ George A. Warner, *Greenbelt. The Cooperative Community* (New York, 1954), pp. 13-14, 16-19; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, pp. 117-119; Cedric Larson, "Greenbelt, Maryland: A Federally Planned Community," *National Municipal Review*, Vol. 27 (Aug., 1938), pp. 413-414; *New York Times*, Oct. 10, 1937; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, pp. 2-3; "Housing Under the Resettlement Administration," 1936; "Greenbelt," *Time*, Vol. 30 (Sept. 13, 1937), p. 10; *First Annual Report of the Resettlement Administration*, p. 45; Conkin, *Tomorrow A New World*, p. 311; "Site Plans for 'Greenbelt' Towns," *American City*, Vol. 51 (Aug., 1936), pp. 57-58; "Greenbelt Towns," 221.

²⁴ Conkin, *Tomorrow A New World*, p. 311; Larson, "Greenbelt, Maryland," pp. 413-414. One article indicated that 4,472 acres were reserved for the town. "Housing Under the Resettlement Administration," p. 1936.

The cost of the land was tabulated differently in the cost of Greenbelt by various authors. Sometimes, apparently, the total cost of all the land, including that given to the Research Center, was added to the cost of the project. At other times, only the amount used by the town was added. And a number of statistics exist for how many acres were set aside for the town and how much this land cost.²⁵

The plan called for building in the country to avoid the high costs of urban land, and by providing a market for the local farmers, it would "do much to provide a genuine union between rural and urban life." The community would be placed in the center of a large tract of land, leaving a large ring of the surrounding land undeveloped to form a protective belt. All of the "greenbelt" (and hence the name) would be held by a single owner—at first the government and later a corporation of the residents—which would enable the community to control its destiny and rationally plan its future development. No slums would develop; there would be no encroachment by metropolitan overflow, and the values of the land and the homes would remain stable. All the illogical aspects of the old towns which had grown up in a chaotic way would be avoided. The architects could plan the relation of each building to the whole and design to meet the human needs; they believed they were "creating a stage, a theater for the good life."²⁶

The residential dwellings at Greenbelt were built on a long graceful crescent shaped hill. At the center of the crescent the commercial section of town and the community buildings were

²⁵ Rather than 3,600 acres being set aside for the town, the Farm Security Administration (FSA) calculated that 3,371 acres were set aside costing \$556,623.15. A Navy cost accountant and one time Mayor of Greenbelt calculated that the land cost \$561,000 or \$564,000 if the gardens were added. One of the designers figured that 3,300 acres of the land were set aside for the use of the town costing about \$90 per acre. A further variation was that 3,371 acres were set aside costing \$555,257. Farm Security Administration, *Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration*, 1941, p. 35; Parker, "Labor Under the Farm Security Program," pp. 1368-1375; Warner, *Greenbelt*, p. 215; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, p. 127.

²⁶ John Dreier, "Greenbelt Planning: Resettlement Administration Goes to Town," *Pencil Points*, Vol. 17 (Aug., 1936), pp. 401-406; Clarence S. Stein, "New Towns for New Purposes," Lewis Mumford (ed.), *Roots of Contemporary Architecture* (New York, 1952), pp. 339, 345; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, pp. 120-127; Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities* (New York, 1938), p. 452; Mayer, "A Technique for Planning Complete Communities," *Architectural Forum*, Vol. 66 (Jan. & Feb., 1937), pp. 21-26, 135.



Greenbelt, Maryland. Photograph by Raymond Faass.

located, roughly equidistant from all the homes. The major road of the town ran along the outside of the hill in an arc and then looped back along the inside of the ridge. The architects avoided the old grid pattern of streets, and the crescent shaped hill between the two arcs was divided at 1,000 foot intervals by roads connecting the two arcs. The homes were thus separated into five large superblocks.²⁷

Each superblock was fifteen to twenty acres in size (roughly five to six times the regular block) and contained ninety to 120 homes or about seven families per acre. The city was planned to allow it to expand to triple its size with little strain upon its facilities. The RA planned to build 1,000 dwellings but only completed 885 units. Since the work was performed by unskilled relief labor, materials which they could handle had to be employed. Prefabrication was avoided in order to employ as many men as possible.²⁸

²⁷ Parker, "Labor Under the Farm Security Program," p. 1375; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, pp. 127-128.

²⁸ For example, Block "D" had between 400 and 500 people living in 122 units. "Greenbelt Towns," pp. 221-222; Larson, "Greenbelt, Maryland," pp. 414-415;

The houses faced the interior of the superblock, which was developed into a park. Of the 885 units, five were single detached homes, 574 were multiple dwelling houses, and 305 were larger row units. Approximately 40 per cent of the row units were of cinder block and had flat roofs, while 60 per cent were of wood frame covered with brick veneer, with pitched roofs. The five or six variations of house plans were mingled together in an aesthetic way. The houses were heated by a central plant so there was no need for basements, and the sub-surface water conditions made basements costly and impractical. Each group of units had separate gardens, service entrances, and garages. The size of the units varied from 1, 2, or 3 rooms in the multi-family dwellings (the architect's synonym for apartment) to 3, 4, 5, or 6 rooms in the row units. The cinder block houses and some of the brick units were painted white with blue trim, while others were left in the natural brick.²⁹

The kitchens were completely electric. The first floor of the units were concrete and tile, while the second floor of the brick houses were hardwood. The units could be furnished for about \$300—the furniture and interior decorating being planned by the WPA area project. Since the research of the planners indicated that living rooms were used only for weddings, funerals, and “to house the rubber plant,” the traffic pattern in the

Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, pp. 311-312; “Comparative Architectural Details in the Greenbelt Housing,” *The American Architect*, Vol. 149 (Oct., 1936), pp. 21, 25; “F.S.A.: Farm Security Administration,” *Architectural Forum*, Vol. 68 (May, 1938), pp. 415-416; Warner, *Greenbelt*, p. 215.

²⁹ One of the critics charged that the walls had to be waterproofed at a later date because “the first residents didn’t appreciate the privilege of their children . . . plying their toy boats in the living rooms” every time it rained. There is no substantiating evidence for this charge. Ed. Thornhill and Fred. Dearmond, “Another Social Experiment Goes Sour,” *Nation’s Business*, Vol. 28 (Oct., 1940), p. 24.

Duncan Aikman, “Tugwelltown,” *Current History*, Vol. 44 (Aug., 1936), p. 98; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 3; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, pp. 311-312; Dreier, “Greenbelt Planning,” pp. 402-407; “Housing Under the Resettlement Administration,” pp. 1397-1398; “Comparative Architectural Details in the Greenbelt Housing,” pp. 22-24; Larson, “Greenbelt, Maryland,” pp. 415-416; “Greenbelt Towns,” p. 221.

For some of the Architect’s floorplans which have been reproduced, see: “Comparative Architectural Details in the Greenbelt Housing,” pp. 22-25; “Resettlement Project: Greenbelt, Maryland,” *Architectural Forum*, Vol. 65 (Oct., 1936), p. 299; “F.S.A.: Farm Security Administration,” pp. 415-424; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, pp. 118-177, and appendices.

houses was planned in such a way as to induce a greater use of the living room.³⁰

The landscaping of the interior of the superblocks and the numerous playgrounds for children was done with native shrubbery salvaged when the land was cleared. Over 200 men worked a full year to convert a swamp into a lake, ten feet deep and fed by over fifty natural springs, at the cost of \$72,000. President Roosevelt dumped the first of several thousand fish, provided by the Bureau of Fisheries, into the lake. He told the assembled workers that "the project is an achievement that ought to be copied in every city in the Nation." Unfortunately, the lake soon proved to have so much bacteria that swimming, one of its major goals, was prohibited. The Resettlement Administration then built a \$72,000 swimming pool.³¹

The picnic areas at the lake and the playgrounds were built for recreation and to keep the children off the streets. The sidewalks ran through the interior of the blocks for pedestrian safety, rather than parallel to the roads. Pedestrian underpasses were built so that no child had to cross a street to get to school. In the first sketches of the town over 60 miles of roads were planned, but in the final draft only six miles of streets were necessary. Because of the curved pattern of the streets there were no blind corners or obstructions to the driver's vision. In the first decade of their existence there was only one traffic fatality in the three Greenbelt towns combined.³²

³⁰ The sizes of the units varied, but for example in a two-story group house the living room was 12½ x 18, the dining room 10 x 11½, and the kitchen 7½ x 12; on the second floor the three bedrooms were 10½ x 12½, 10½ x 11½, and 8 x 9. In an apartment unit the living room was 12 x 18, the bedroom 12 x 12, and dining room-kitchenette 8 x 12. "F.S.A.: Farm Security Administration," pp. 417-423; Mayer, "A Technique for Planning Complete Communities," p. 131.

³¹ Although one critic charged in 1938 that all the fish had died, there is clear evidence that they were very much alive in 1940. Merle Thorpe, "Fever Chart of a Tugwelltown," *Nation's Business*, Vol. 26 (Nov., 1938), p. 13; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 42, 52, 111-112, 169-170.

"Housing Under the Resettlement Administration," p. 1397; Roy S. Braden, "Plan for Community Living," *Public Management*, Vol. 20 (Jan., 1938), pp. 11-12; "The Presidency," *Time*, Vol. 28 (Nov. 23, 1936), pp. 13-14; Rosenman, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, V, pp. 588-589.

³² *Hearings on S. 351*, p. 76; Parker, "Labor Under the Farm Security Program," p. 1375; Albert Mayer, "Greenbelt Towns: What and Why," *American City*, Vol. 51 (May, 1936), p. 61; Gerald G. Gross, "Greenbelt: The Boondoggle That Made Good," *Washington-Post*, June 8, 1947; "Greenbelt Towns," p. 221; Stein,

Garden walk in Greenbelt. Photograph by
Raymond Faass.



Every effort was made to make the community safe and aesthetically pleasing. The WPA decorated the schools and the community buildings. On the pilasters on the side of the school was chiseled a "frieze of artistic characters." In the library a "social realistic" mural was painted. The titles of some of the "inspiring" paintings at Greenbelt were: "Pouring Concrete," "Constructing Sewers," "Concrete Mixer," and "Shovel At Work." And the front of the community building had a bas-relief dramatizing the preamble of the Constitution.³³

Toward New Towns, p. 128; *First Annual Report of the Resettlement Administration*, p. 44.

For a more detailed description of the traffic record of the first few years, see: Hugh A. Bone, "Greenbelt Faces 1939," *American City*, Vol. 54 (Feb., 1939), p. 55.

³³ *New York Times*, Oct. 10, 1937; "Culture, Recreation and Commerce Hand-in-Hand," *Architectural Record*, Vol. 90 (Sept., 1941), p. 80; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 196; Bone, "Greenbelt Faces 1939," p. 55.

Various figures exist for the cost of this model city. All three Greenbelt towns were added together by one author—2,267 units at \$36,200,920 or \$15,968 per unit. A statistician in the U.S. Department of Labor was told in 1942 that the total investment was \$36,163,655.27.³⁴

It was possible to list the cost of Greenbelt alone at \$13,450,000 and then add that the price of constructing the buildings was only \$4,799,000. A Navy cost accountant and one time mayor of Greenbelt concluded that Greenbelt cost \$13,450,000. And there are a plethora of other statistics which only added to the confusion.³⁵

The House Appropriations Committee was told in 1942 that the total investment in Greenbelt was \$13,722,000. The next year the Hearings on the Farm Security Administration (FSA) was told that the total investment in the project was \$13,701,817.17—but the total cost was only \$8,819,732.66 or \$9,909.81 per unit. That is, something like \$5 million had been “written off.” An historian used the same figures but calculated that the per unit cost was \$15,395. *Time* magazine calculated (undoubtedly based on a FSA report) that Greenbelt had cost \$14,227,000, but \$8,500,000 was “written off” which meant that the per unit cost was only \$5,423. *Time* also reported that the adjoining land had increased in value to \$4,000 per acre, whereas the RA had paid only \$98 per acre.³⁶ Using the same sort of “write off” logic, there would seem to be no reason why not only the total initial cost of the land could be “written off,” but also \$3,902 per acre subtracted from the total cost of the project because the value of the land had increased. Indeed, in the murky jungle of accounting manipulations some of these figures may have been reached in just this fashion.

The authors’ calculations were usually trying to determine the project’s success and to evaluate if the government could

³⁴ Sternsher, *Rexford Tugwell and the New Deal*, p. 277; Parker, “Labor Under the Farm Security Program, p. 1375; *Hearings on the Agriculture Department Appropriation Bill for 1943*, Part 2, p. 235.

³⁵ For example, one source indicated that the three cities cost \$36,200,910 but were sold for only \$19,559,763.

³⁶ *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 3; Warner, *Greenbelt*, p. 215; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 325; *New York Times*, Sept. 2, 1937.

³⁶ Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 233; *Hearings on the Agriculture Department Appropriation Bill for 1943*, Part 2, p. 235; *Hearings to Investigate . . . the Farm Security Administration*, p. 1118; *Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration*, 1941, p. 6; “Greenbelt,” p. 10.

build successful low cost housing without subsidizing the rents. An historian concluded that it would take 300 years for the town to pay for itself. But he pointed out that the FSA "wrote off" one third of the cost due to relief labor; deducted the amount of unused greenbelt; and since the town had been planned for three times its size, the initial costs were disproportionate and would decrease as the town reached full growth. Rexford Tugwell and others emphasized this last point, and it has considerable validity for the costs indeed decreased when 1,000 units were subsequently built.³⁷

After deducting everything, one critic calculated that it could be seen that the town could be amortized in sixty years—if nothing was spent for maintenance. A Congressman concluded that it cost \$9,740,576 or \$9,740 per family. One of his colleagues figured that \$8,819,732.66 of the original \$13,761,817.17 should be counted, or \$9,909.81 per unit. An economic historian concluded that the costs were to be amortized in sixty years, but in order to accommodate the low income groups at low rentals rates, the government was willing to "write off" 25 per cent of the costs.³⁸

Although the FSA calculated the cost of Greenbelt at \$14,227,000, it deducted \$4,902,000 for relief labor. The FSA deducted the costs of the facilities which private builders did not normally install—schools, commercial buildings, recreation center, and the expensive sewage and water plants. The FSA then deducted \$614,000 for the undeveloped land inside the town, and \$643,000 for the land outside of the town, and then \$284,000 for recoverables. The belt was the central concept of the project, but the land held its value so it was deducted from the costs. Finally the FSA came to the conclusion that the per unit cost was only \$4,423.³⁹

If Greenbelt was a demonstration, a model which it was hoped private industry would imitate—there was no reason to

³⁷ Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 320; Gross, "Greenbelt: The Boondoggle That Made Good," *Washington-Post*, June 8, 1947; Tugwell, "Should the Administration's Housing Policy Be Continued?" p. 114; Tugwell, "The Meaning of the Greenbelt Towns," pp. 42-43.

³⁸ George Morris, "\$16,000 Homes for \$2,000 Incomes," *Nation's Business*, Vol. 26 (Jan., 1938), p. 46; "Cooperative Corners: Greenbelt, Maryland," *Literary Digest*, Vol. 124 (Oct. 16, 1937), pp. 16-17; *Congressional Digest*, 75th Cong., 1st Sess., May 20, 1937, p. 4879; *ibid.*, 78th Cong., 1st Sess., June 10, 1943, p. 5617; Mitchell, *Depression Decade*, p. 338.

"write off" the costs of the land and the facilities. The "writing off" procedure was an effort to determine the cost per unit so that it could be demonstrated that the building industry could build homes in which low income families could afford to live. These families could certainly afford such housing if all the facilities—water, sewage, schools, stores, the cost of most of the labor, and the streets—were absorbed by the federal government. But if private building produced such a town the residents would have to pay for these facilities. It was quite justifiable to separate the costs of building the houses from the cost of building the associated facilities. But there was no justification for deducting most of the costs of labor and the cost of the facilities and concluding that private construction could provide comparable accommodations for \$4,423. It was correct to deduct a proportion of the expense due to the unskilled relief labor in order to obtain the cost of building this model town under normal conditions. But there was no justification for "writing off" the cost of the facilities of the "yardstick." If the \$5,423 or the \$4,423 figure was used for the cost per unit of the model, the model no longer existed. The town, consisting only of a series of houses, would then have to install a sewage plant, water plant, build a lake, schools, library, community center, and stores—and the resident would then have to pay, either by taxes or the merchant's profit. The increased prices of goods and the higher taxes would then make it impossible for the lower income group to afford to live in Greenbelt.

On one occasion Tugwell threatened: "If private industry persists in its refusal to exploit the possibilities [of low rent housing] . . . the pressure of public opinion may force the government to enter this field on a very wide scale." And yet at the same time he confessed that there may indeed be some elements of subsidy in the projects. One hostile critic made a fairly valid point when he commented on Tugwell's "yardstick": "What the Government probably inadvertently teaches private industry is that, where expenditures are too high, the solution is not to reduce expenditures, but increase deductions."⁴⁰

The project had three official objectives: to employ relief

³⁹ "F.S.A.: Farm Security Administration," p. 416.

⁴⁰ Tugwell, "Should the Administration's Housing Policy be Continued?" pp. 114-116; Morris, "\$16,000 Homes for \$2,000 Incomes," p. 22.

workers, to demonstrate that a new kind of community planning was possible, and to provide low rent housing. The first objective was achieved. The relief rolls from several Maryland counties and from the District of Columbia were absorbed, and it was estimated that twice as many jobs were thereby created in private industry providing the materials. In the total relief picture, however, the numbers employed building Greenbelt were rather insignificant.⁴¹ The second objective was achieved by "writing off" most of the relief labor—the first objective—and by "writing off" the costs of facilities which were an integral part of the planned community. If these facilities had not been "written off" the third objective could not have been achieved. Low rent housing was achieved only by a heavy government subsidy.

One author was repelled by equating success with dollars spent. He believed that Greenbelt was a success regardless of the costs. He asked: "How can a community be a failure, even in a bookkeeping sense, that offers better living conditions than any city in the United States?"⁴² The residents of Greenbelt were enthusiastic and would agree that the experimental community was a success.

A rigorous screening process was implemented to choose 885 families from perhaps as many as 12,000 applicants. The applicant's incomes were checked so that the goal of housing for low incomes could be fulfilled. If they qualified, they were taken to the site, and the project was explained. Then a detailed questionnaire was filled out, and they were visited by a social worker. Their character, sense of responsibility, intelligence, community cooperative spirit, and religiosity or loyalty to an idealistic group were evaluated. Their present residence was compared to their incomes. The most desirable families were those who were socially maladjusted and who lived above their means because this revealed that they had been unable to find adequate

⁴¹ Parker, "Labor Under the Farm Security Program," pp. 1374-1375.

For various statistics on the relief workers employed at Greenbelt, see: Thornhill and Dearmond, "Another Social Experiment Goes Sour," p. 25; Aiken, "Tugwelltown," pp. 97-98; *First Annual Report of the Resettlement Administration, 1937*, p. 17; "Final Sale of Government Property in Greenbelt," *American City*, Vol. 69 (Sept., 1954), p. 207; Braden, "Plan for Community Living," p. 13; Larson, "Greenbelt, Maryland," p. 414; Dreier, "Greenbelt Planning," p. 407.

⁴² Frederick Gutheim, "Greenbelt Revisited," *Magazine of Art*, Vol. 40 (Jan., 1947), pp. 16-17.

housing. There were further evaluations by people holding such titles as "Senior Selection Specialists" before they were accepted as residents.⁴³

The families were chosen on a basis corresponding to the percentage of the residents of Washington—70 per cent government employees, 30 per cent non-government employees, 30 per cent Catholics, 63 per cent Protestants, and 7 per cent Jews. Although Greenbelt was to contain the same population distribution as Washington, there was one glaring omission—no Negroes were admitted.⁴⁴

The incomes permitted were based on a sliding scale depending upon how many members were in the family. A University of Maryland professor who resided in Greenbelt recorded that the ranges were \$1,000 to \$2,000. A Mayor said that the limits were \$800 to \$2,200. And the FSA director said that the limits were \$1,200 to \$2,600.⁴⁵

Residents of Greenbelt were usually very young families. The median age of heads of families was calculated to be twenty-nine. The first families of Greenbelt averaged 3.2 members. The size of the families rapidly changed, and many observers came away with the impression that most of the women in Greenbelt

⁴³ John B. Holt, *An Analysis of Methods and Criteria Used in Selecting Families for Colonization Projects* (U. S. Department of Agriculture: Social Research Report No. 1, Sept., 1937), pp. 44-50; R. C., "Eugenics at Greenbelt," *Journal of Heredity*, Vol. 28 (Oct., 1937), pp. 339-344; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 316.

The figures on how many applications were made varies; see also: Francis Fink, "First Resettlers: Greenbelt, Maryland," *Literary Digest*, Vol. 124 (Nov. 6, 1937), pp. 13-15; "Greenbelt," p. 10.

⁴⁴ How far the procedure of proportional characteristics was carried is uncertain. One author believed that professions—professors, carpenters, etc.—were chosen proportional to Washington. It is doubtful if it was carried any farther than religion and government or nongovernment employment. Aikman, "Tugwelltown," p. 100.

The rationale for not admitting Negroes was that they had their own project—separate but equal—"Langston Terraces," in northeast Washington.

Warner, *Greenbelt*, p. 62; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, p. 128; Larson, "Greenbelt, Maryland," p. 417; Fink, "First Resettlers," pp. 14-15.

⁴⁵ *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 3; *Hearings on the Agriculture Department Appropriation Bill for 1943*, Part 2, p. 237; Bone, "Greenbelt Faces 1939," p. 59; Warner, *Greenbelt*, p. 62.

Time said that the income range allowed was \$1,000 to \$1,200 which is an obvious error. Some of the other figures given are—\$1,000 to \$2,200—Parker, "Labor Under the Farm Security Program," p. 1375; \$1,000-\$2,000—Aikman, "Tugwelltown," p. 99; \$1,200-\$2,400—Larson, "Greenbelt, Maryland," p. 416-417; \$1,000-\$2,100—*New York Times*, Oct. 10, 1937; and \$1,200 to \$2,000—"Cooperative Corners," p. 17.

were perpetually pregnant. The *New York Times* noted that the birth rate was four times as high as the nation as a whole. Social scientists became very curious, studied the phenomena, and wrote learned articles such as "Eugenics at Greenbelt" and "Fertility in a Greenbelt Community." The high birth rate was explained by the young age of the selected residents. The selection process also meant that the residents had similar incomes and occupations. Instead of there being very little stratification, a sociologist who resided there, discovered a highly complex status structure.⁴⁶

The Greenbelters were enthusiastic and whenever a visitor asked what they did for amusement, he was told—"We organize!" And organize they did. Only ten months after the first residents moved in, twenty-nine clubs and organizations had formed including scout troops, church groups, veteran groups, a camera club, bridge club, radio club, rifle club, widow's club, intramural sports, drama, band, and choral clubs, and a journalism club which produced the town's mimeographed newspaper. There were thirty-five groups by the end of the first year. The morale was so high and the residents so active that one resident commented: "If anything, the citizens of Greenbelt are overstimulated." Soon after the first anniversary of the town, a stay-at-home week was declared, and a moratorium placed on all club and civic activities.⁴⁷

Many of the clubs met in the school which served a variety of functions. It served as community center and was used as the town meeting hall. The town had a community Protestant church of fourteen denominations which met in the school auditorium. The Latter Day Saints and the Lutherans held services in other rooms of the school. The Jews used the school

⁴⁶ The birth rate in 1937 and 1938 was 64.5 per 1,000 people compared to a national rate of 18.6; Warner, *Greenbelt*, p. 166.

Stein, *Toward New Towns*, p. 128; Farm Security Administration, *Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, 1938*, p. 20; *New York Times*, Nov. 24, 1938; "Co-op Stores Grow in Greenbelt," *Business Week* (May 14, 1938), p. 18; Fink, "First Resettlers," p. 15; R. C., "Eugenics at Greenbelt," pp. 339-344; Elbridge Sibley, "Fertility in a Greenbelt Community," *Social Forces*, Vol. 20 (May, 1942), pp. 476-477; William H. Form, "Status Stratification in a Planned Community," William M. Dobiner (ed.), *The Suburban Community* (New York, 1958), pp. 209-225.

⁴⁷ Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 7, 74-75, 82, 84-87, 91, 96; Bone, "Greenbelt Faces 1939," pp. 59-61; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 13; P. S. Brown, "What Has Happened at Greenbelt?," *New Republic*, Vol. 105 (Aug. 11, 1941), p. 184.

on Friday evenings, and Catholics held mass in the cooperative movie theater. Adult education classes were held in the school. The WPA taught art courses, and the University of Maryland (only four miles away) offered courses for credit at Greenbelt.⁴⁸

The residents were enthusiastic about the experiment they were making in cooperative living. E. A. Filene, a wealthy philanthropist, organized the Consumer's Distribution Corporation which established all the stores on a cooperative basis. A self-service grocery store, a service station, barber shop, drug store (with soda fountain), a 658 seat movie theater, general merchandise store, beauty parlor, shoe repair shop, valet service and laundry were established. Two per cent of the gross was paid to the government as rent. Greenbelt Consumers Services (GCS) was set up, and when half of the families had purchased a \$10 share, the Filene corporation turned the cooperative stores over to GCS. Greenbelt Consumers Services prospered, rising from 303 to 4,004 members, from \$3,430 to \$395,336 in stockholding, and from \$54,398 to \$934,587 in assets. The shareholders received a maximum dividend of 4 per cent and the extra profit was distributed as rebates to the patrons proportional to how much they had spent at the stores. By 1954 GCS paid \$103,000 in dividends and \$285,000 in patronage rebates.⁴⁹

The cooperative spirit spread even to the school children, who formed a "Gum-Drop" co-op at ten cents per share to buy candy and school supplies. They too, soon declared a dividend. A cooperative medical plan was set up. A five dollar membership fee and monthly payments of \$1.50 for a bachelor and \$2.00 for a family of five paid for care at the health clinic. The health cooperative was constantly in trouble and folded in 1950. The newspaper, in the cooperative spirit, was free and published by

⁴⁸ Larson, "Greenbelt, Maryland," p. 416; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, pp. 157-158; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 88-89; Bone, "Greenbelt Faces 1939," p. 60; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, pp. 312, 318; Brown, "What Has Happened at Greenbelt?" p. 182.

⁴⁹ "Co-op Stores Grow in Greenbelt," pp. 17-18; *New York Times*, Sept. 2, 1937; *ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1937; *ibid.*, Sept. 8, 1937; *ibid.*, Oct. 10, 1937; *ibid.*, Jan. 28, 1940; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 60, 89, 216-217; "Government Backs Cooperatives," *Business Week* (Sept. 11, 1937), pp. 30-32; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 4; "Greenbelt Goes Completely Cooperative," *Readers Digest*, Vol. 33 (Oct., 1938), p. 36; "Co-op Transfer," *Business Week* (July 29, 1939); pp. 16, 19; "Greenbelt Takes Over," *Business Week* (Feb. 3, 1940), p. 35.

volunteers. The women formed a milk cooperative and contracted for the milk. The residents saved an estimated \$3,810 on milk in the first year.⁵⁰

The cooperative town received a charter from the state before there was a single resident. A council-manager type of government was established with five councilmen being elected without party designations. The manager had complete control over the town employees. Until 1946 a number of the city employees, such as treasurer and town manager, were really employees of the federal Public Housing Administration and received only \$1 per year for their role in the city government. If this had not been done, the city would have had to pay a full salary to these men. This complicated evaluating Greenbelt's success because it was saved several thousand dollars a year by this hidden government subsidy.⁵¹

The government subsidized the town directly by payments "in lieu of taxes." The court case which prevented one of the projects from being built stemmed from the local populace's resentment of the government removing a large section of land from the tax rolls. The city or county obviously could not tax the owner—the federal government. Congress solved this problem by passing a bill allowing Washington to make small payments "in lieu of taxes."⁵²

Every year the residents quarreled with the government about the amount of the payments "in lieu of taxes." These payments averaged between 75 and 85 per cent of the city budget, but the residents resented the federal government's strangle-hold on their budget. These payments defrayed most of the costs of the usual functions of local government. When this subsidy, which enabled the rents to be kept low, was stopped, the tax rates became one of the highest in the county, and the town had to curtail many of its services.⁵³

⁵⁰ *New York Times*, Jan. 28, 1938; Bone, "Greenbelt Faces 1939," p. 61; "Greenbelt Goes Completely Cooperative," p. 36; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 44-46, 82-84, 97-108, 146-147; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, pp. 5, 6.

⁵¹ Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 318; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 58-60; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 13.

⁵² "Trouble for Tugwell: New Jersey Taxpayers Sue over 'Greenbelt Town'," *Literary Digest*, Vol. 120 (Dec. 21, 1935), p. 7; *Congressional Record*, 74th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1936, pp. 8763, 9023, 9827, 9865, 10495, 10596-10597.

⁵³ *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 9, 13-14; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 130, 219; J. W. Rabbitt, Jr., "Mechanizing Accounting Records in the Smaller Community," *American City*, Vol. 56 (June, 1941), pp. 62-64; U. S. House of Representatives,

The social scientists calculated that no more than 20 per cent of a family's income should be spent on rent. Since over one-third of all non-farm families had an income of less than \$1,500 in 1936, they should have spent only \$25 per month for rent. The statistics which the RA gathered showed that \$25 rented only the most shabby and inadequate accommodations. The pleasant houses at Greenbelt were rented by a one-year lease from the Department of Agriculture. The rent was always due in advance, and the government was quick to evict. The statistics vary but in general the average rent was \$31.28. A one and a half room apartment rented for \$18, and a seven room unit rented for \$41.⁵⁴

One of the designers pointed out that the rents which people in this low income group could afford would pay only the operating costs and not return the government's original investment. In 1941 and 1942 the town returned slightly more income to the government than the cost of operation. But Illinois' Republican Representative Everett M. Dirksen pointed out that this did not take into account depreciation, which was just one more entry for the statisticians to quarrel over. For the five year period 1944-1948, the total excess of income over expenses was \$756,703.⁵⁵

Banking and Currency Committee, *Suburban Resettlement Projects. Hearings . . . H.R. 2440, A Bill to Authorize the Public Housing Commissioners to Sell the Resettlement Projects*, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., 1949, p. 11; Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, p. 171; *Hearings on S. 351*, p. 76; *House Report No. 1430*, p. 7.

⁵⁴ Another source says that 25 per cent of the income was the limit, not 20 per cent. Larson, "Greenbelt, Maryland," p. 416.

E. L. Kirkpatrick, "Housing Aspects of Resettlement," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 190 (March, 1937), pp. 94-100; Warner, *Greenbelt*, p. 36; "Greenbelt," p. 10; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 316.

The rent figures vary; see: Parker, "Labor Under the Farm Security Program," p. 1375; Stein, *Toward New Towns*, p. 128; *Report . . . of the Farm Security Administration*, 1938, p. 20; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 3; Braden, "Plan for Community Living," p. 13.

⁵⁵ One critic used the FSA figures for 1940 which he said showed a profit of \$53,221. Then he added the "payments in lieu of taxes" and concluded that it really was a deficit of \$68,225. Thornhill and Dearmond, "Another Social Experiment Goes Sour," pp. 107-109. However, payments "in lieu" usually were figured into the expense. See for example: *Hearings . . . H. R. 2440*, p. 18.

Stein, *Toward New Towns*, p. 169; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 320; *Hearings . . . H. R. 2440*, p. 18; *Hearings on the Agriculture Appropriation Bill for 1943*, pp. 235-236; *Hearings to Investigate . . . the Farm Security Administration*, p. 1118.

A problem was created by the income requirements for residents. All additional income which any member of the family received had to be reported to the city manager. Should the family's income rise above the level permitted they were no longer allowed to live in Greenbelt. Critics sneered that Greenbelt was the only community in the capitalistic world where a person could be evicted for making too much money. A piece of doggerel of a Greenbelt poet ended with the plea—"Please, boss, don't give me a raise!" The townspeople were concerned because the ablest citizens were those who also succeeded in their jobs, and they felt that the town was losing its ablest men. With the wartime inflation the government was forced to allow temporarily an income 25 per cent above the ceiling. But by March, 1942, 300 of the 885 families had incomes exceeding this new limit and their leases were not to be renewed. The FSA then adopted a sliding scale of rents. This new scale eventually became out of date, and one of the designers commented in 1949 that if the rates were updated to a higher level, the town would not only pay for its operating costs but also give an ample return on the government's investment.⁵⁶

In addition to lampooning the threat of a man being evicted for doing his work so well that he was promoted, a number of other features of the town were ridiculed. The Greenbelters reportedly felt that Uncle Sam was a good landlord; the critics believed that the project was the ultimate in regimentation, and they had a field day with a series of harmless rules. Pets were forbidden. A *New York Times* editorial depicted tearful children and their angry parents confronting a rather immovable project director. There was a rule that washing had to be off the clothesline by 4:30 p.m. "No weary \$35 a month renter of a \$16,000 house," one man wrote, was to have his aesthetic sense violated by the "sight of silk pajamas flapping in the breeze."

⁵⁶ Fink, "First Resettlers," p. 15; Aikman, "Tugwelltown," p. 99; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 37-38, 153-155, 180-181; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 6; Brown, "What Has Happened at Greenbelt?," p. 184; Gross, "Greenbelt: The Boondoggle That Made Good," A 2741; *Hearings on S. 351*, p. 76.

Hearings on the Agriculture Appropriation Bill for 1943, pp. 237-238; this seems to indicate that the rent was not raised, but this hearing seems to have been held prior to the raise. The FSA director's comment that \$2,600 was the rent limit is patently wrong, so perhaps the rest of his testimony is equally as garbled.

A clause in the lease required every resident to mow his lawn periodically. If he were remiss in his duties, the management mowed it and added the cost to the rent bill.⁵⁷

One aspect of life in Greenbelt was rather ironic. Franklin D. Roosevelt believed that industry could locate in the country due to electrical power and that people would live in these rural communities because transportation would allow them to enjoy the culture of the city, but yet live in the more pleasant environment. In Greenbelt these two assumptions failed. It became a dormitory city for government workers rather than acquiring any industry of its own. And transportation plagued the city for a quarter of a century. The original contract FSA made with a bus company guaranteed a 6 per cent profit. The government ended up subsidizing the company \$800-900 per month, and at the end of the year the contract was not renewed. For the next decade it was an hour trip to Washington by bus and by slow street car with one or two transfers being necessary. The town finally bought its own bus, but transportation has continued to be a grave problem.⁵⁸

The foundation of the city on the hill was first shaken when the FSA gave permission in 1940 to allow private housing to be built in Greenbelt. The government still owned the land, however, and the three basic models of houses were designed by a project architect to conform to the town's plan. A Greenbelt Homeowners Corporation was set up which subleased the homes.⁵⁹

The model town was dealt a major blow during the Second

⁵⁷ Brown, "What Has Happened at Greenbelt?," p. 184; *New York Times*, Nov. 15, 1937; *City of Greenbelt, Maryland: Information Handbook*, p. 12; "Through the Editor's Specs," *Nation's Business*, Vol. 26 (May, 1938), p. 9; Thorp, "Fever Chart of a Tugwell Town," p. 13; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 316; Braden, "A Plan for Community Living," p. 13; Aikman, "Tugwelltown," p. 97; Churchill, "America's Town Planning Begins," pp. 96-97; Bone, "Greenbelt Faces 1939," p. 59; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 5; Warner, *Greenbelt*, p. 37.

⁵⁸ Stein, *Toward New Towns*, pp. 130-131; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, pp. 5-6; Larson, "Greenbelt, Maryland," p. 420.

⁵⁹ This was the first issue the government tried to solve: the problem of people whose income rose above the ceiling and who desired to remain residents of Greenbelt. Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 153-155; "'Greenbelt' Towns Opened to Privately Financed Housing," *American City*, Vol. 55 (Aug., 1940), p. 69; Florence E. Parker, "Cooperation in the Building of Homes," *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 52 (Feb., 1941), pp. 292-321; "Private Housing in Greenbelt Towns," *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 51 (Sept., 1940), p. 643.



Statue of mother and child, by Lenore Thomas. W.P.A. The Center, Greenbelt, Maryland. Photograph by Raymond Faass.

World War. Under the Lanham Defense Housing Act 1,000 units were built at Greenbelt. The houses conformed to the original plan and were far less expensive to build (indeed, the law set a maximum of \$3,950 per unit), since no land cost entered the total, and the facilities had been planned for three times the original size of the town. The roads, water and sewer systems, swimming pool, commercial and community centers were already installed.⁶⁰

The new defense houses did not really compare to the older units. There was very little landscaping, no inner paths, only very small gardens, and very few trees. The walks and street lighting were inadequate. There were no pedestrian underpasses, and the police had to escort the school children across the streets. The spacious parks on the interior of the original superblocks were neglected in the later development, and the children had to play in the streets and paved service courts, where a small child was killed when struck by a garbage truck.

⁶⁰ *Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration*, 1941, pp. 25-26; C. B. Baldwin, "FSA's 6th Year in Rural Housing," *Housing Yearbook*, 1941, pp. 251-252; "Farm Security Administration, Defense Housing," *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 53 (Oct., 1941), p. 928.

The units were not well insulated, and the residents said they could hear their "neighbors break an egg."⁶¹

The influx of veterans into the defense units disrupted the life in Greenbelt. The elementary school went on double shifts, and eventually the government had to build more classrooms. The veterans were not screened, and they were never completely assimilated into the town since the turnover rate was as high as 32.6 per cent in one year. Apathy set in, and the town meetings were scantily attended.⁶²

The per person cost for running and maintaining the town decreased markedly as the population increased, proving the validity of the assertion that the costs were disproportionate because the facilities had been built for three times Greenbelt's actual size.⁶³

Even before the first resident moved into Greenbelt, the RA and later the FSA came under attack, and there were persistent attempts to form an investigating committee.⁶⁴ Finally plans to liquidate the projects were thrown into the hopper. Greenbelt was to be sold by the Public Housing Commission at a fair price, determined by an appraisal of an independent real estate expert. Veteran groups were to be given the first chance to purchase the town. A down payment of 10 per cent was demanded, and the remainder was to be amortized over a twenty-five year period at 4 per cent interest.⁶⁵

⁶¹ Stein, *Toward New Towns*, pp. 139-142, 148-158; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 183-184; Gutheim, "Greenbelt Revisited," p. 18; Brown, "What Has Happened at Greenbelt?" p. 183.

⁶² Gutheim, "Greenbelt Revisited," p. 18; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 184-185; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 6; Brown, "What Has Happened at Greenbelt?" p. 184; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 322.

⁶³ Stein, *Toward New Towns*, p. 171; *Hearing on S. 351*, p. 76; U.S. House of Representatives, Banking and Currency Committee, *Disposition of Greenbelt Projects*, Report No. 402, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., 1949, pp. 3-4; Clarence S. Stein, "Greendale and the Future," *American City*, Vol. 63 (June, 1948), pp. 107-109.

⁶⁴ *Congressional Record*, 75th Cong., 1st Sess., 1937, pp. 685, 1195, 6819-6820; *ibid.*, 77th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1942, p. 1005; *ibid.*, 78th Cong., 1st Sess., 1943, pp. 378, 1079, 1859, 1895, 2185-2188, 2190-2194, 7232, 7405, 7418; *Hearings to Investigate . . . the Farm Security Administration*; U. S. House of Representatives, Appropriations Committee, *Hearings on the Agriculture Department Appropriations Bill, 1948*, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., 1947, pp. 1467-1468.

⁶⁵ "Congress Acts to Preserve Character of Greenbelt Towns," *American City*, Vol. 64 (July, 1949), p. 113; U. S. House of Representatives, Appropriations Committee, *Proposed Provision for National Housing Agency Appropriations, 1947*, Document No. 584, 79th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1946; *Congressional Record*, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., 1949, pp. 932, 4011, 4471, 4492-4493, 5291, 5833-5834, 5979-5980, 6005, 6075, 6156, 7254; *Hearings on S. 351*; U. S. *Statutes at Large*, Public Law 65, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., 1947, Vol. 63, Part 1, Chapter 127.

The Korean War delayed liquidation until 1952. The sale was a very complex series of sales, each of which included specific portions of housing and land. The Greenbelt Veterans Housing Corporation (GVHC) purchased most of Greenbelt for \$8,973,767, and the three projects were sold for 53 per cent of their costs. Subsequently the water and sewage systems, the fire alarm system, some of the community buildings, the swimming pool, cemetery, athletic field, garbage dump, the playgrounds and roads were donated to the city by the federal government. The GVHC holds all the land in single ownership but conveys the right to "perpetual use" to the resident; undertakes all major repairs of the buildings; and is empowered to terminate the contract of any citizen whose conduct is objectionable in thirty days.⁶⁶

The sale of Greenbelt was a traumatic event in the community's history; it then had to pay for construction, repair work, insurance, maintenance of the facilities, and it had to pay rent on the fire station, police station, and the city offices. It discontinued the kindergarten; dropped the town library; replaced the fire department with a volunteer one; and the garbage collection was put on a service fee basis. The community center was sold to the county board of education. The full-time nurse, health officers and recreation supervisors were dropped. The payments "in lieu of taxes" had enabled the town to provide services which few towns in Maryland could equal. The town began to scrutinize its services and budget very closely indeed.⁶⁷

The town had further shocks. An airport grew up on its southern boundary. What was left of the protective belt began to vanish rapidly. The city found itself constantly enmeshed in zoning controversies as the land allotted to private building companies was sold and subdivided. The city was unable to prevent the building of high rise apartments and hired a special

⁶⁶ 25th Anniversary Greenbelt, pp. 8-9; Conkin, *Tomorrow a New World*, p. 325; "Greenbelt Houses Sold to Cooperative Group," *American City*, Vol. 67 (Dec., 1952), p. 125; "Greentowns All Sold by Federal Government," *American City*, Vol. 68 (March, 1953), p. 113; Warner, *Greenbelt*, pp. 201-208; *Enjoy Living in Greenbelt: A Planned Cooperative Community*.

⁶⁷ 25th Anniversary Greenbelt, pp. 9, 13-14, 16; Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities*, p. 459. Lewis Mumford had observed in 1938: "Without doubt the prime obstacle to urban decentralization is that a unit that consists of workers, without the middle class and rich groups that exist in a big city, is unable to support even the elementary civic equipment, of roads, sewers, fire department, police service and schools."

zoning attorney to fight the case through the courts. The value of the belt has been virtually destroyed, but the town hopes the federal government will intervene. Recently a \$250,000 bonding referendum to purchase some of the area surrounding the lake and lake frontage passed. The town owns only meager parcels of the belt. And the town with no jail has hired an extra policeman as the criminal arrests, and traffic accidents almost doubled, and the summonses more than doubled between 1963 and 1964.⁶⁸

The town has not fulfilled the fondest dreams of some of its most fervent advocates. The three objectives of the project were, to be sure, quite admirable. They were, however, only partially realized. Relief workers were employed, but their numbers were insignificant to the total relief picture. A model city demonstrating town planning was built—embodying several praiseworthy features, such as planning the pedestrian and automobile traffic patterns for the maximum of safety. But the model was established as such by “writing off” the costs of labor and the facilities which made it a demonstration community. And pleasant adequate housing was provided for low income families—but at the expense of heavy government subsidy. In materialistic and capitalistic terms the town has to be adjudged considerably less than a success. Some extenuating circumstances must in all fairness be taken into account. From the time of the establishment of the Resettlement Administration to the time when the first resettlers moved into Greenbelt the project was barely over two years. Due to the urgency of the moment, the time from the drafting board to the ground breaking was incredibly short. Greenbelt was constructed, in effect, during a hurricane. The project embodied three goals in an attempt to accomplish several tasks at once; it was constructed during a time of economic turmoil; it was designed by idealistic young men; the RA was directed by a controversial and vulnerable public figure; and by 1937, when the project was completed, the administration had come under a heated political attack.

⁶⁸ Gutheim, “Greenbelt Revisited,” p. 19; *25th Anniversary Greenbelt*, p. 13; *City Council Election: Parkland Acquisition Referendum, Tuesday, September 21, 1965*; Personal letter from Albert S. Attick, Acting City Manager, dated Feb. 17, 1966; *Annual Report 1964: City of Greenbelt, Maryland; City of Greenbelt: 1965/66 Budget Approved*.

Although the model city has crumbled at the foundation and has become in many ways just like any other town, it has left a heritage. The architects and planners continue to study the community. The urban planners and sociologists continue to pour out an overwhelming volume of literature on urban and suburban problems. One volume notes that the United States, which needs a policy of planned development and has the most "gargantuan literature of research and analysis," has not yet made any attempt "to limit suburban sprawl or to relieve city constipation by planned dispersal." The problems with which the RA was concerned are indeed contemporary as can be seen by the establishment of a Cabinet post of Housing and Urban Development. One volume catalogues the new towns and greenbelts which have been built in the world since 1900. In the United States the author lists only a few towns, most of which do not fill the requirements of a new town. Over fifty countries are listed and several thousand towns. India alone has planned 100,000 planned villages for 67 million people. The Soviet Union is building eight towns in the greenbelt surrounding Moscow alone. The literature on the English Greenbelt towns is overwhelming. And Israel has built several hundred new towns.⁶⁹

Some of the planners realize that Greenbelt, Maryland, was not exactly an unqualified success, nor an ultimate solution to the problems of Megalopolis. But they emphasize that the Greenbelt towns were indicators, rather than demonstrations, pointing toward certain policies for the future.⁷⁰ They were one link in the chain between the nineteenth century Garden cities and the New Towns of the twentieth century, attempting to grapple with the gargantuan problems of urban life.

⁶⁹ "Cities," *Time*, Vol. 87 (March 4, 1966), pp. 29-33; Frederick J. Osborn and Arnold Whittick, *The New Towns: The Answer to Megalopolis*, (New York, 1963), pp. 139-143; John Scofield, "Israel, Land of Promise," *National Geographic*, Vol. 127 (March, 1965), pp. 417-420; A. E. Perks, "Greenbelts for Canada's Big Cities," *American City*, Vol. 60 (Sept., 1945), p. 133.

⁷⁰ Stein, *Toward New Towns*, pp. 217-226; Churchill, "America's Town Planning Begins," p. 98.

PRIEST NEALE AND HIS SUCCESSORS*

By JOHN W. McGRAIN, JR.

Part II

AFTER the French Revolution, secular priests in exile began to come to the United States. The Rev. Charles Leander Lusson, a Franciscan, became a member of the Corporation set up under Maryland laws, and was assigned to Priestford as an assistant, or perhaps farm manager, on a salary from the Corporation's income; he was probably the first priest to attend the little stone church at Hickory.

Father Lusson, perhaps not understanding Americans and their total lack of church organization, got into conflict with Father Boarman as reflected in some letters. Boarman wrote to the newly elected Bishop of Baltimore, Dr. John Carroll:

I left Baltimore yesterday evening in great trouble of mind. Our affairs in Harford in a most deplorable state. I am without a shilling to go through all the labours of my extensive mission and without the least assistance spiritual or temporal. Our new Trustees are chosen and have nothing done for me. Either I must have both farms restored to my sole management immediately that I may provide in future for myself or my pension 35 (pounds) for the last year must be furnished without delay as I am really suffering for necessaries. If I may make a choice, I would rather retire from both farms with a pension as above of thirty five pounds per annum, and give up the farms to some vigorous active American, English or Irish gentleman, who can also assist me on the Missions sometimes as occasions might require, for I never will agree they should remain in or hereafter be put again into French hands. Whatever reform in your management may be decided on, I beg you will be so kind as to furnish me a Gentleman able and proper to assist me on the missions as I cannot hereafter go through the fatigue of it alone. I will be very thankful for an answer by the first occasion. I am in due esteem your very humble servant.

SYLV. BOARMAN

* Part I, "Priest Neale, His Mass House, and His Successors," appeared in the September, 1967 issue.

Father Lusson wrote his side of the farm management problem to Bishop Carroll from Deer Creek, May 7, 1797:

I have made all my preparations on it and I perceive all the cheat and baseness of soul of Mr. Boarman. By his false and ill grounded reports, whom make use of all his endeavors, to push me out of my management. I have given him the reading of your last letter and I have told him I was ready to accomplish with the will of my betters in all that is just and reasonable—now (it) is not just and reasonable you will deprive me of my management without well grounded reasons or my consent which certainly I will not give you, after having spent my money for all necessary things and victuals, for this present year. If I have told you in my last visit to Baltimore, I could live no more with Mr. Boarman, you must acknowledge the sincere man can't live with those of such a character like this of Mr. Boarman and we must be fenced against such men. As for me, I will not carry any reports against him before you, but pray, my Lord, pay us one visit by yourself and believe me your diocesans want it and then you will judge very differently on my behavior and you will receive more complaints against him than perhaps you will hear of.¹

Father Boarman was otherwise well thought of, and in fact he seems to have been of rather good humor. On taking the examen under the Jesuit Constitutions in 1805, he was formally asked if he had ever committed murder or perjury. "As to the first he said he did not know but what he might have killed a man thro the bushes without seeing him, and as to the second he did not know how it might be with us all when we abjured the King of England; he made us laugh so much that the Superior said he could not go on with the examination."²

In 1798 an Irishman, the Rev. Dr. Cornelius Mahoney spent a year at Priestford before being assigned to Albany by Bishop John Carroll. The Rev. Guillaume Pasquet de Leyde, another French secular, arrived before 1800 and remained six years. He had left Santo Domingo after the slave rebellion.³ Mr. Pasquet was soon in difficulties with the debts on the plantation. He spent £ 230:19:7-1/2 of his own money discharging debts against the estate, and £ 285 were still due to other claimants. The

¹ C. F. Thomas, P. A., *The Boarmans* (Washington, D. C., 1934), p. 74ff.

² *Ibid.*, letter of Fr. Robert Molyneux, September 26, 1805.

³ Anabelle M. Melville, *John Carroll of Baltimore* (New York, 1955), p. 159.



Archbishop John Carroll. 1735-1815. Painting by Gilbert Stuart. Georgetown University.

Corporation was in 1801 only able to give him \$200 plus \$36 to pay interest on \$600 he had borrowed to keep the place going. The debts mounted, and in 1804 the board of the Corporation instructed Mr. Pasquet "that the supernumerary slaves thereon be disposed of to humane and Christian masters."⁴ Two ex-Jesuits, now archbishop and auxiliary bishop of Baltimore, sat on the board; they were John Carroll and Leonard Neale, a nephew of the late Father Bennett Neale. The following year, the Jesuit order was re-established in Maryland by the affiliation of the ex-Jesuits of Maryland with the surviving Jesuits of Russia, where the brief of suppression had never been promulgated by the Empress Catherine. A distinction now grew up between the restored Jesuits and the immigrant and native priests within the jurisdiction of Archbishop Carroll. Before the installation of the archbishop, the Jesuits constituted the entire Catholic administrative body. Their congregations contributed nothing to their support, nor did they expect anything.

⁴ Thomas J. Hughes, S.J., *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal* (New York, 1908, 1917), *Documents*, I, p. 295.

They had no endowment other than the proceeds of estates they owned or were bequeathed. A bishop, on the other hand, required a source of revenue for his priests and constructions as well as for his own support. Archbishop Carroll held title to almost nothing. He first acquired title from the Jesuits to Saint Peter's Church in Baltimore, little more than a house, at Saratoga and Little Sharpe Streets, and the revenues of the Bohemia estate.⁵ The gradual reorganization of the Church structure and the inevitable conflict of ambitions and loyalties, complicated by the Jesuits' debts and their understandable reluctance to fade away into a secondary role, grew into a disheartening controversy in which the Deer Creek property was a painful issue. The scholarly verbal struggles over this rustic church and other Maryland estates was a miniature of the growing pains of the American Catholic Church; when the battle ended, the church was no longer in a missionary status in the East but on its way to a normal state of self-sufficiency and support, however grudging, by its congregations.

The Corporation decided to create a perpetual fund by selling off various tracts, and in March 1806, they advertised in a Baltimore paper:

FOR SALE

A Parcel of LAND, containing two hundred and sixty acres, more or less, situated partly on both sides of Deer Creek in Harford County, state of Maryland. Its situation is well known in Harford County, under the name of the *Old Works*, as it was on this tract of land that an iron forge, a grist-mill, an oil mill, &c, were formerly erected. It is an excellent mill seat. The improvements, at present are, a Dwelling House, good Kitchen, Smoke House, Corn House, and an old Barn. There are on the premises a good Apple Orchard, and a great quantity of Peach Trees. With little pains and expence, twelve or fifteen acres of meadow ground might be made. The land is particularly renowned for the excellent quality of its timber, consisting of large Oaks, Poplars, Walnut, and a great sufficiency of Chesnut, for fencing or other purposes. The quantity of wood land is about one hundred and fifty acres.

For terms, apply to Mr. Benjamin Green, jun., living near the premises; the reverend William Pasquet, head of little Bohemia,

⁵ John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886), III, p. 67.

Caecil County; reverend Francis Beeston, Baltimore, or the subscriber at George-Town, district of Columbia.

Francis Neale⁶

March 31.

But no buyer came forth, and in 1806, Mr. Pasquet was authorized to rent out Arabia Petrea and Deer Creek. He was given a bond for his own expenditures and was transferred to Bohemia, which also deteriorated under his management until his removal by Archbishop Carroll.⁷

The next year, another secular clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Eden (formerly Edenschinck), the first priest at Alexandria, Virginia, arrived. He was allowed the entire profits of the plantation plus the sums received for the sale of a "black girl" and two "black boys." Finally in 1814, Archbishop Carroll found a buyer for the old Thomas Shea estate, Dr. James Glasgow of Baltimore. Carroll had the Corporation vest the title in his own name as a trustee of the Corporation to convey the property according to their direction as soon as he was able to discharge its debts. Dr. Glasgow paid \$4200 for Paradise. Carroll "purchased for the benefit of the future resident at Deer Creek, in Mr. Neale's name, in the 6% loan, \$3000; and otherwise placed \$300 on the same interest."⁸

The resident of Deer Creek, Father Eden, had died on New Year's Day 1814, and was reputedly buried under the front steps. When the plantation was sold, it had no occupant. Dr. Glasgow moved in, and his son inherited the place in 1823 and held it until it passed to a relative, Harris Archer, the architect, in the 1880's. Some of the bodies were removed from the Shea burying-place, which had been open to all Catholics. The plot can still be located in a thicket, 200 yards west of the former chapel house, where large stones without dressing or inscription protrude from the light brush. The Glasgows never operated the mill, although the name Glasgow Mill lingered a while before the "Old Works" deteriorated and vanished.⁹

⁶ Baltimore *Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser*, March 31, 1806.

⁷ John Carroll to William Pasquet, Baltimore, July 14, 1815, Baltimore Cathedral Archives, 9A-CU.

⁸ John Carroll to John A. Grassi, S.J. (Maryland Jesuit superior), Baltimore, Aug. 25, 1815, in Hughes. *Documents*, I, p. 298f.

⁹ Samuel Mason, Jr., *Historical Sketches of Harford County, Maryland* (Darlington, 1955), p. 65.

In 1815, a secular clergyman, the Rev. Roger Smith, was assigned to the Deer Creek parish. He was a native of Frederick, a grandson of Colonel Edward Pye. He had entered the new Saint Mary's Seminary in Baltimore in 1808 and was ordained in 1815. His territory, somewhat reduced from the original parish of three counties, included visitations to private homes, such as the Ignatius Wheeler-Henry McAtee house at Clermont Mills and excursions from Baltimore to Mr. David Williamson's chapel at Pikesville. Other stations mentioned were "The Barrens" and Long Green.¹⁰ With the Glasgow family living in the former Mass House, he was without a residence. He lived in Baltimore for a time, and later boarded with his brother, Sam Smith, a mile west of Hickory. A year later he wrote to Charles Neale of the Corporation at Georgetown College:

Rev. and Dear Sir,

I find with much regret that you are very slow in commencing the building, designed as a residence for the priest of Harford. You have forgotten us; or you have given up the idea of undertaking it. I am sorry for either. If a multiplicity of business prevents you from taking this into consideration, it is hard that we should suffer. I know, Rev. Father, that you are overwhelmed; but perhaps my establishment in Harford for the good of religion is not a thing of small importance. I can do nothing. I have neither power nor means. As to the dependence of the trustees, it is a mere bagatelle. If you could pay us a visit, it would be well. If you could come for the purpose of making a beginning, it would be still better; because you are the man of money. If your personal assistance can not be had, then say I may depend on the \$800 in your hand, and the money in the hands of Mr. Green; and we will soon have a house built near the church, either stone or frame. I will undertake it; I will make a stir among the people. But, if you will not grant us the means, then everything may stand as it is, and go to rack, before I meddle or interfere. We have waited a long time; I hope you will not put our patience to trial any longer.

As to your other business . . . Someone in Harford told me to inform you that the present tenant is cutting down the wood and carrying it off to Baltimore . . .¹¹

¹⁰ Msgr. E. P. McAdams, "Catholicism and the Catholic Parishes in Harford County, in the Year 1940," *Harford Democrat and Aberdeen Advertiser* (Bel Air), September 6, 1940.

¹¹ Hughes, *Documents* II, p. 806; Md.-N.Y. Province Archives, 108 A.



"The Most Rev. Leonard Neale. Second Archbishop of Baltimore." 1746-1817. Published by John Murphy, Baltimore. Hayden Collection. Maryland Historical Society.

Smith was allowed \$180 a year from the invested money paid by Dr. Glasgow,¹² plus \$20 from Arabia Petrea rents. In April of 1816, Archbishop Carroll's successor, Archbishop Leonard Neale, made an agreement with the Jesuits as to which parishes they should control permanently. The Harford County properties were assigned to the Jesuits and the concordat was agreed to and signed at Georgetown. But the following year, the Most Rev. Dr. Ambrose Maréchal, a French Sulpician father and not a member of the Corporation, was appointed Archbishop of Baltimore. He considered the distribution of properties between Jesuit and archdiocese control as impossible for the maintenance of his authority. As he wrote (in French) some years later, "Never was I more surprised than when I saw this list. It contained more than half the parishes of my diocese . . ."¹³ Maréchal had no salary from the Corporation and an uncompleted cathedral without revenues. The Corporation offered to pay him \$500 a year until the cathedral would be finished, but there was no formal agreement, and the payments lapsed.¹⁴

¹² *Ibid.*, I, p. 301.

¹³ *Ibid.*, I, p. 302.

¹⁴ Shea, *History of Catholic Church*, III, p. 67.

The new archbishop disregarded his predecessor's assignments and took back the Hickory church. By this time, the influx of refugee priests and graduates from the Baltimore seminary had reduced the Jesuits to a third of the Catholic clergy in Maryland. On August 22, 1820, the agent of the Jesuits' Corporation, Father Adam Marshall, sold the \$3000 lot of United States Bonds to build a purely Jesuit seminary at White Marsh. The fund's interest had been supporting the homeless Mr. Roger Smith at Hickory, but Francis Neale wrote in retrospect in 1832:

... with respect to the demand of Harford Congregation the case simply is this—The Corporation sold an Estate called Deer Creek situated on a river or creek of the same name purchased by a bargain made by Bennet Neale, an Uncle of mine who was a missionary at Deer Creek Church, and lived on the Plantation above mentioned, which he had purchased about five miles distant from said Deer Creek Church. Now, Sir, the Deed for said Plantation purchased as above stated was made to Bennet Neale by the proprietor on this condition, which is implied in the Deed, that Bennet Neale would allow the proprietor lodging, board and all things necessary during his life and that on these conditions he made the above Deed to Bennet Neale heirs and assigns for ever. This property was numerated among the estates which fell under the Corporation of Maryland clergy, consequently it was the property of the Corporation under the very charter of the said Corporation and to be dealt with by the same Laws. Now the trustees finding they were much involved in debt, were obliged to give their consent that the Agent should sell certain lots or portions of ground, in order to make up a sum of more than 30,000 dollars due by the extravagance of some persons employed on our farms. This farm of Deer Creek was consequently sold.

My absence from Baltimore obliged the buyer, one Glascoe, to deposit the purchase money into the hands of the Most Revd. Bishop Carroll, who deposited the same money into the bank in my name, I being then the agent of the Corporation. The bank paid the usual interest, which was the property of the Corporation under my guardianship, and subject to my order. In order to help the payment of this great debt, I assisted the then Agent, Mr. Adam Marshall, by giving him a control over the sum deposited in the bank, which he sold for ready money, and liquidated a part of the debt of the Corporation.

This, Sir is the History of the 3000 dollars obtained from the sale of the estate of Dear Creek. It belonged not to Harford Con-

gregation, but it did belong to the Corporation, and was actually its property.

Mgr. Archbishop Ambrose Maréchal brought the affair to Rome—accused Mr. A. Marshall of the *Sacrilege* by selling the property belonging to the Church, but nothing [conclusion illegible] . . .¹⁵

Father Adam Marshall wrote to the General of the Jesuits that "the Archbishop considered himself the guardian of this fund, and demanded an explanation of the reasons for withdrawing it, which I declined giving him. The priest who then attended Harford was a secular; the church belongs to the Bishop and is one of those which Bishop Neale agreed to give up to the Society and the present Archbishop took away again."¹⁶

Father Smith wrote to Maréchal that the congregation would not support him, having previously enjoyed the gratuitous services of endowed incumbents. The Archbishop had visited Harford County on September 24, 1819. He spent several days in the area, celebrating Mass at Mrs. Grème's house and at Hickory where he admired the church and its furnishings, graveyard, fences, and linens, went fishing, and made a gastro-nomic progress among the Boarmans, Greens, Smiths, and "Greames". The following October he returned and inquired into the history of the parish.¹⁷

The Archbishop had Smith's successor, the Rev. Timothy O'Brien, take some sworn statements from old-time residents of the county to show that Mr. Shea gave his property for the support of a resident pastor, and not for the general use of the Jesuits. The Archbishop urged Father Francis Neale to "put an end to the scandalous discourses to which it give occasion." He insisted that Mr. Shea could not have specified in writing his intent of endowing the priests of Harford, "since the existence of such an instrument would have exposed his donation to be defeated, according to the iniquitous laws existing in 1764." He attached certificates given by Mr. Pat Bennet; Messrs. Thomas, William, and Edward Jenkins; and Mr. Thomas Millen. Other certificates, usually small slips of paper, were by Sarah and William McMath, Matthew and Elizabeth Cain, G. W. Lee, Freeborn Brown, Clement Green, Elizabeth

¹⁵ Md. Province Archives, 108 A17.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 108 A13.

¹⁷ "Diary of Archbishop Maréchal, 1818-1825," *Records of American Catholic Historical Society*, XI (1900), p. 433.

Schinelein, A. J. Grème, and Samuel Doherty. No one remembered the original sale to Father Digges in 1743.

In addition to the above certificates, I hereby certify, that I have always (I think for forty years past,) understood that the farm on Deer Creek, usually called *the Priest's farm* was given to the Deer-creek congregation for the use and maintenance of the clergy attending the same, & have also enquired a Mrs. *Floyd*, a respectable woman of my neighborhood, 60 odd years of age, who was born, & raised in the neighborhood of the church, say that it *was given* to the congregation for that purpose by an old gentleman whom she well knew, by the name of Thomas Shey, or, *Shchy*, though commonly called *Shy*, & I have no doubt of the fact.

26th February 1821

Thos. Hillen

I hereby certify that the lands that James Glasso now possesses did belong to the Catholics as i understand, these sixty years and before that time, and at the time of the donation that it was appropriated for their use by Mr. Shea, the donor.

—Freeborn Brown

Robert Boarman declared that Henry Cooper had said "that the property in question was left by Thomas Shea under an explicit clause that it should be inherited pro tem by the attending priest of Harford Catholic congregation as otherwise the congregation would not be able to support a clergyman."

Samuel Doherty lived at Deer Creek from 1769 and understood that Thomas Shea "left it at time of his death"; A. J. Grème, wrote that Shea left it "on the condition that Mr. Neale should support the donor during life", and also understood that the sale money was to go to support the Hickory chapel. The Archbishop closed his covering letter with:

I might bring you many collateral proofs of the same fact. But I hope that the Corporation will reflect seriously upon the subject and stop the mouths of those who loudly accuse it of a notorious and scandalous injustice. *Justicia elevat gentem*; and I am sure you would look upon it as a great misfortune to enrich the Society by the breach of a religious trust. I remain respectfully, Rev. and Dear Sir,

Y . . . + Ambr. A.B.¹⁸

¹⁸ Ambrose Maréchal to Francis Neale, S.J., March 1, 1821, Baltimore, Province Archives 108 A14. Similar certificates are on file in the Baltimore Cathedral Archives, No. 2214.

The Corporation trustees, meeting in August 1821, declared that the certificates failed to show their "conscientious obligation to apply the proceeds exclusively to the support of the attending clergyman of Harford Congregation", but they were "justified in applying the property in question to the use of religion in any manner they may judge proper." It was September before they replied to Maréchal, informing him that none of the witnesses had heard Mr. Shea state his intentions, that their statements were but the hearsay of aged relatives, and that "such evidences are not, in any tribunal known to us, received as demonstrative proof where property is in question."¹⁹ In November, Father Marshall sold Arabia Petrea and the adjoining tract, Conveniency, to Mr. Thomas Stump on behalf of the Corporation.

By this time Maréchal was in Rome where he put his claims to Deer Creek and a tract at White Marsh, Prince George's County, before the Pope. He claimed that the Maryland Legislature's act of 1792 invested the property in the Bishop and clergy of Maryland, and he insisted that the Corporation had promised Baltimore bishops \$1000 a year perpetually.²⁰ The matter was referred to a commission of Cardinals, who agreed with Maréchal, and in July, 1822 the Pope issued a brief to the Jesuit General instructing the Maryland Jesuits to turn over to Maréchal 2,000 acres at White Marsh, free and clear. All other property was confirmed to the Jesuits. But the Maryland Jesuits rejected the brief as surreptitious and obtained without giving them a chance to reply. Father Charles Neale declared that the Maryland legislature had conferred no rights to anyone not a member of the Corporation. The Jesuit General in Rome refused to sign the papers of transfer,²¹ declaring that the terms did not meet his original conditions for peace.

When the Jesuits' agent, Father Adam Marshall, withdrew the \$3000 of the Deer Creek sale proceeds, there remained in the hands of Archbishop Carroll's executor about \$1200 not deposited in the bank. According to Hughes' deductions from Jesuit letters, the Jesuits in 1821 or 1822 actually brought suit against the attorney, Daniel Carroll Brent, executor and nephew

¹⁹ Hughes, *Documents*, I, 306.

²⁰ Shea, *History of the Catholic Church*, III, p. 68.

²¹ *Ibid.*, III, p. 69.

"The Most Rev. Ambrose Maréchal, Third Archbishop of Baltimore." 1768-1828. Painting by Bardley. Engraved by J. Sartain. Published by John Murphy, Baltimore. Graphics Collection. Maryland Historical Society.



of the late Archbishop and heir to any residue of the estate. Hughes states that their corporation indeed won a judgment that the money belonged to the society, but Mr. Brent was unable to pay the debt from the residue of the estate.²²

The dispute continued in both Rome and Baltimore. Maréchal began an extensive Latin correspondence with his superiors in Rome, the Office for the Propagation of the Faith, which governed the church in America, then considered a for-

²² Hughes, *Documents*, I, p. 466. Also, Lawrence J. Kelley, S.J., "Father Charles Neale and the Jesuit Restoration in America," *Woodstock Letters*, LXXII (June, 1943), p. 138; Kelley calls the action a "countersuit." However, there is no record of such a case in the Orphans' Court dockets, administrative accounts, claims dockets, or proceeding indices in the Hall of Records; neither is it mentioned in *Bland's Chancery Reports* or the chancery index in the Superior Court of Baltimore City. Hughes was writing to defend his order's historic property rights, but he often put them in a bad light, as in this case, where he seemed to imply that the Jesuits committed the disloyalty of suing their deceased archbishop's estate and its executor, whereas they were suing the Archbishop's personal heir for unidentified church funds that had perhaps been mixed with the deceased's personal fortune. Archbishop Carroll's will, made in his last days, named a number of church properties, but failed to mention any Deer Creek proceeds, Baltimore City Wills, W.B. No. 10, fol. 83, H.R. The Baltimore City Land Records general index shows that Brent, the Jesuit corporation, and the heirs of Archbishop Leonard Neale amicably made over properties for purely nominal sums to the Rev. Enoch Fenwick and Archbishop Maréchal for the diocese in the years before this controversy.

eign missionary territory. The letters were strong and insistent, at times indignant. They recounted the entire Shea donation story, as well as the histories of other disputed properties. Maréchal described himself as surrounded by Jesuits and without resources. He threatened to resign his See. The letters would suffice for a history in themselves, but a few translated paragraphs from one written to the Cardinals of the Propaganda on February 12, 1822 might suggest the tone:

First let me refer to the fact that gave occasion for writing this letter. A loyal Catholic named Thomas Shea, in the year 1754, gave his estate by donation to R. P. Benedict Neale according to his intention that a missionary, who rarely visited the poor Catholics of the Harford community might be able to stay and live among them. About eight years ago the officials of the corporation, who possessed the civil title of the estate, sold it, and at the urging of the most illustrious Doctor Carroll, deposited the price in the Bank of the United States (*dans la Banque des Etats Unis*). For six years the missionary of the Harford community received the annual interest on the principal, which is 200 American dollars.

But about the end of the year 1820 the procurator of the Society came to Baltimore in secrecy and withdrew the principal from the Bank. What happened to this sum of money, I do not know . . .

Meanwhile, poor Catholics of the Harford parish have collected written testimony from a multitude of persons of both sexes by whom it is affirmed as a well known fact that Thomas Shea had given his estate to R. P. Benedict Neale, not that he should transmit it to the Jesuits, but that it might serve in perpetuity for the sustenance of the Harford missionary. Among these witnesses very many Catholic men of Baltimore have been found who are notable for their loyalty, integrity, and age.

I sent all this testimony to the fathers of the society, who were formerly mentioned as members of the Corporation. But they impugned the truth of these testimonies and rejected them because of variations of no moment (indeed they were remarkably consistent with respect to substance of fact) and I sought the civil title, which they have in their hands; they wrote the letter to me from which the text above from the Rev. General is quoted.²³

In 1823 in a letter to the Superior of the English College in Rome, his agent, Father Gradwell, he wrote (in French):

²³ Rome English College Archives, (Latin) in Hughes, *Documents*, I, p. 433.

... the Jesuits are actually in possession of all the goods of the clergy of Maryland. They have absolute administration; and as to the revenues themselves, they are putting them up for sale. A few days ago, in contravention of the brief of Pius VII, they sold to a Quaker named Stump the last of the properties of the Harford County mission, a tract called Arabia Petrea.²⁴

Cardinals Castiglione and de Gregorio conferred in Rome with the Jesuit General, who showed he had ordered the Maryland Jesuits to pay Maréchal \$1000 a year, but in July, 1824 the Propaganda refused that sort of a settlement and insisted that within six months the White Marsh property be conveyed to him as the Pope's brief had directed.²⁵

But the Jesuits of Maryland, or their friends, had stolen a march on Maréchal. Sometime in 1823 according to his suspicions, an unidentified person had taken a copy of the Brief (only two copies had reached the United States) to Secretary of State John Quincy Adams. The Jesuits accused Father William Matthews, rector of Saint Patrick's, Washington, D.C., of having seen Mr. Adams "who was very indignant at such a mode of procedure, and forthwith exclaimed that he would write to Cardinal Gonzalvi."²⁶

Maréchal got wind of this move and wrote on a personal basis to the Marylander, Daniel Brent, first clerk of the State Department; the same Brent, who as executor for Archbishop Carroll's estate, had been sued by the Jesuits' corporation. Brent replied October 24, 1824, and said that, while Mr. Adams had been solicited to write such a letter, he had not yet done so.

... Mr. Adams said he would with the permission of the President of the United States, write a letter to Cardinal Gonzalvi, at that time Secretary of State for foreign affairs, expressive of the regret of the executive government of the U.S., that the government of His Holiness should have been induced to interfere at all in relation to the control or disposition of a trust, or any part of it, thus exclusively created by an act of an independent State of this

²⁴ *Ibid.*, I, p. 507.

²⁵ Shea, *History of the Catholic Church*, III, p. 70.

²⁶ Rev. Joseph Tristram to the General, in Hughes, *Documents*, II, p. 1070. However, Father William Matthews supported Maréchal's claim fully, even while presiding over a Jesuit high school. He could hardly have complained to the State Department. In spite of his working for the good of the Washington Catholic Seminary, the Jesuit faculty suspected his actions. Joseph T. Durkin, S.J., *William Matthews, Priest and Citizen* (New York, 1963), p. 99.

Union, and placed under the exclusive direction of a commission established by that act itself; but circumstances at the time prevented him from doing so . . .

Before closing this letter, I think it my duty to add that I am fully persuaded that the government of the United States, as presently advised, can never view with indifference any future appeals to such foreign states touching the administration of temporal concerns under its own jurisdiction or that of the separated states of this union . . .²⁷

Maréchal protested this move in a letter (French) to Cardinal Fesch on November 4 and enclosed a copy of Brent's letter and gave the first suggestion of any retreat from his demands:

. . . not only have my adversaries represented to Mr. Adams, Secretary of state in our republic that the Brief of Pius VII is a violation of the supreme and independent jurisdiction of the United States, but also to other officers of our government; and they have solicited a threatening letter against the government of His Holiness! ! !

I love the church of Maryland, but I love the catholic church still more, and as it is evident, seeing the bad dispositions of my adversaries, that in insisting on the execution of the Brief of Pius VII, they are able to do the church of J.C. a great measure of harm, I ask you to inform the Propaganda in my name that I will be content with an annual pension of \$1000.

. . . The Jesuits are poor! They are, Monseigneur, the Ecclesiastical My-Lords of my diocese. The secular missionaries are the only true poor ones.²⁸

Maréchal wrote to Daniel Brent the day after receiving his letter and protested that Mr. Adams had been given a false picture of the question; Senator Roger Brooke Taney had assured him that it was legal to appeal to the Pope and to Jesuit superiors in Rome "as a matter of conscience and natural equity."²⁹ He then demanded of the Maryland Jesuit superior, Father Francis Dzierozynski (who had come from White Russia), the names of those who had seen Mr. Adams. In November he warned his agent Gradwell to stand by in Rome for diplomatic protests, and on November 12 warned him that his opponents had approached the governor of Maryland. He threatened to resign and let the See of Baltimore become ex-

²⁷ Hughes, *Documents*, II, p. 1072.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, *Documents*, II, p. 518f.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, II, p. 1073.

tinct. The next day he wrote to the Jesuit superior of Maryland saying that the *National Intelligencer* and "Adams' paper" were about to publish the Papal Brief for all to see. Dzierzynski denied having leaked the document to the press. According to Hughes, the papers indeed carried the brief on December 4 and 8 in English, but microfilms of those issues of the *National Intelligencer* show no such entries. Some wits supposedly circulated an anti-papal cartoon of a menacing pontifex inscribing a large circle on his coveted area of Maryland. In late December, first clerk Brent again assured Maréchal that no formal State Department protest had been made. Maréchal's reaction may be judged by the following passages from a Latin letter to Cardinal Della Somaglia, December 21, 1824:

... by various false and insidious arguments they urged the secretary of state, Mr. Adams to write a threatening letter to the pontifical regime and to R. P. Fortis. To this cardinal I transmitted a copy of the letter from Mr. Daniel Brent, secretary to Mr. Adams, by whom this deed was snatched from the darkness and first revealed to me.

To this the criminals added another crime a little later; behold the copy of the Brief of Pius VII which I sent to them after my return from Europe, which they committed for printing into the hands of a protestant journal of Washington, that they might stir up a blind multitude of the heterodox against the authority of the Holy See, as if that authority were some new and formidable threat to the peace of the citizens and to their peaceful possession of their temporal assets. I send as an enclosure part of a daily paper in which the imprint was made on the 4th of the present month . . .

Unusual fear ran through Catholic minds as soon as these dark deeds were dragged into the light. They were stupefied to see religious men who were by vocation required to defend the Holy See, calumniating its sacred authority, as much among our republican rulers as among the American people.

That these false impressions might be removed from the mind of Mr. Adams, one of our Maryland Senators, renowned for his loyalty and his learning in the law, wrote to the first secretary, D. Brent. I send along his reply, from which the Sacred Congregation can see that the Jesuits have invited our government not to allow the Supreme Pontiff to force their obedience by even spiritual means.³⁰

³⁰ *Ibid.*, II, p. 522f.

In January, 1825, having heard of the Jesuit moves and their application to John Quincy Adams, Father Gradwell wrote to Maréchal from Rome:

After the delay of surrendering White Marsh, I conceive very well that it is designedly impoverished and delapidated, and that the sum which you consent to accept in lieu of it may be preferable. But after what we have seen, I have no faith that those Jews will any more part with the money than with the land.³¹

The diplomatic protest apparently was never made, but once the Archbishop had learned the feelings of Mr. Adams, he began to hedge. According to the records of the National Archives:

The United States had no formal diplomatic relations with the Roman States in this period. Formal diplomatic relations between the United States and the Papal States were not established until 1848. The United States had consular representatives at Rome in the period 1824 to 1826, but no mention of the dispute between the Society of Jesus and the Archbishop of Baltimore Ambrose Maréchal over the ownership of the above-mentioned lands has been noted in the dispatches sent by these consuls to the Department of State. Other series among the Department of State records in the National Archives have also been examined, but no record has been found of any documents in which the State Department gave an interpretation of the Pope's decision in the controversy or protested the action taken by him.³²

But whether or not the United States expressed its feelings, the next Pope, Leo XII, decided against trying to persuade a Maryland corporation of its moral, but not necessarily legal, debts to their spiritual leader the Archbishop. "... the Sovereign Pontiff after meetings of the Propaganda, May 29 and June 20, 1826 accepted a proposition made by the Jesuit General, in his name and that of his successors, to pay Archbishop Maréchal during his natural life annually 800 Roman crowns from November 1, 1826, and Cardinal Somaglia wrote that the Pope and Sacred Congregation thought that the offer ought to be accepted."³³ The Archbishop accepted on Christmas Eve. The

³¹ *Ibid.*, II, p. 1084.

³² W. Neil Franklin, Chief, Diplomatic, Legal, and Fiscal Branch, U. S. National Archives and Records Service, to-author, Washington, April 15, 1965.

³³ Shea, *History of the Catholic Church*, III, p. 70f. Shea was convinced that a diplomatic protest had taken place, but had never found a copy of its text.

incredible controversy that had begun with a Harford County farm and a farm at Bowie, had become a question of moral import and tested the yet unknown relations, or lack of relations, between church and state, and raised the now-familiar question of the Pope and the United States government: is the Pope a spiritual advisor who happens to live overseas, or as the Maryland Jesuits were willing to imply in this instance, a foreign potentate, and a meddlesome one at that? The Archbishop seems to have been touched with near madness on this one issue of Jesuits and their "machinations", much like the popular anti-Jesuit suspicions of the French and Indian War days. In other respects, Maréchal proved himself an able administrator and helped put a missionary diocese on a business basis; he settled a number of schisms and helped pacify recalcitrant boards of parish trustees. His triumph was brief; he died following a trip to Emmitsburg in 1828, having collected but \$1000 of his pension, not enough in Hughes' opinion to pay the postage and fees to support his litigation. The property at White Marsh was managed by the Corporation for more than a century and a quarter; it was sold to the Levitt Corporation in 1960 for \$1,700,000 and is a part of the residential development of Belair, in Prince George's County.³⁴

The legal status of the Archbishop of Baltimore was eventually clarified by an act of the General Assembly of Maryland in March 1832, whereby Archbishop Whitfield and his successors were created a corporate sole, the first such enactment in the United States.³⁵

Dr. Archer quoted a Mr. Lochery, a Harford County old-timer, who was quoting an even more ancient, eccentric gentle-

No such document appears in Leo F. Stock, *Consular Relations Between the U. S. and Papal States, 1779-1870* (Washington, D. C., 1945). An opinion written by Senator R. B. Taney, dated January 8, 1826, also implied that no Department of State action had been taken, Cathedral Archives, No. 2214.

³⁴ The White Marsh tract was left to Father George Thorold in 1729 by James Carroll, a bachelor of Anne Arundel County. A fire of 1853 wiped out the historic original school and church buildings. It was here that John Carroll was nominated for the bishopric in 1788. Effie Gwynn Bowie, *Across The Years In Prince George's County* (Richmond, 1947), p. 409.

³⁵ Patrick J. Dignan, *A History of the Legal Incorporation of Roman Catholic Church Properties, 1784-1932* (Washington, D.C., 1933), p. 158; Act of 1832, Chapter 308.

man named Toy, silversmith of Abingdon, who had indignantly remarked about the Jesuits' withdrawal of the Deer Creek sale money, "When the priests cheat each other, who's to do the cussin'?"³⁶

Father Timothy O'Brien finally had a rectory built onto the Hickory church in 1822.³⁷ In spite of its long history, the earliest written parish record is Father Smith's entry of 1817, "Jos Quinlan, lawful son of Benjamin and Patty Quinlan, born 11th of April 1817. Baptized 22nd of June 1817. Sponsors E. and J. Bussey. R. Smith, Priest." Somewhere in these years, Archbishop Maréchal presented to Saint Ignatius a silver chalice which was a gift of Louis XVIII; it was mislaid for many years but recovered for the sesquicentennial of 1942. The chalice is decorated with grape, wheat, and acanthus (eternity) symbols.³⁸ The parish was incorporated in 1818, with the first corporate trustees' meeting May 31, 1819. The trustees met under the presidency of Father Smith. They were Henry McAtee, Clement Greene, Robert Boarman, and John Kean. Edward F. Bussey was elected secretary. Also elected a trustee was Augustus J. Grème, son of the French captain, Angus Grème, who had taken a liking to the Priestford area when marching through with Lafayette's army and had returned in 1793 to settle at Maiden's Bower on Tobacco Run. The Grème house had been a quasi-home for some pastors, including Fathers Boarman, Pasquet, Mahoney, and Eden. The trustee system, which almost everywhere in the United States fell into both disuse and disrepute and only recently was revived, continued at Hickory well into the 1930's.

Since this classic period, the Hickory church has enjoyed a long succession of rectors, but this history concludes with Archbishop Maréchal's settlement with the Jesuits and the end of the "glebe" system of Roman Catholic church support. In 1848, the nave was extended to the present length. The tower, which now leans, was built in 1865. One rector, the Rev. Jacob A.

³⁶ George W. Archer, "The History of the Old Catholic Chapel at Priest's Ford, Harford County," *United States Catholic Historical Magazine*, III (1890, Reprint, in Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore), p. 19.

³⁷ J. Alphonse Frederick, "Early Roman Catholic Worship in Harford County," *Times* (Bel Air), July 30, 1937.

³⁸ Walter L. Read, *Souvenir Booklet Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of St. Ignatius Parish, Hickory, Harford County, Md.* (Bel Air, 1942), pp. 9 and 18.

Walter, on a later assignment, escorted Mrs. Surratt to the gallows.³⁹

The country church called the "Cathedral of Harford County" begot the other five Catholic congregations of that county, two in Baltimore, and one in Cecil, and was said to have been "the church that Cardinal Gibbons loved."⁴⁰ Today it has no resident pastor, but is administered from Saint Margaret's, Bel Air. In May 1967, the building was found structurally unsound and was closed.

Paradice Farm was once owned by Harris Archer, Baltimore architect; he installed a number of mantels and partitioned off the main hall, but was not concerned with recreating the eighteenth-century appearance. The Harlan sisters came next; they were noted antiquarians and descendants of the Glasgow and Archer families. The Harlan ladies rescued their possessions from the fire of 1940. Miss Mary Harlan stayed on until 1961. The farm is now owned by Lt. Col. William W. Graham (USAF, Ret.) and his wife, who are restoring the building; the present tract is 75 acres, the rest having been sold to the War Department in 1942. A number of fantastic errors have been affirmed of the plantation. Samuel Mason of Darlington called it the "Trappist Monastery" and carefully distinguished it from the "Trappist Church" of the same neighborhood.⁴¹ We need hardly say that a Jesuit is not exactly a Trappist, nor is a country priest's residence a monastery, and the Chapel of Ease on Trappe Church Road was not Catholic. Henry C. Forman, Eastern Shore architectural writer, said in 1934, "As strange as an event in Kubla Khan that 'Paradice' should have been a colonial monastery on the banks of Deer Creek in America! In the Jesuit Chapel, now the living room, monks used to chant."⁴² The Mass of Father Bennett Neale's time was read quietly, and no organ was present, let alone monks to chant. Forman even found stones outside that indicated "the former existence of a refectory and other out

³⁹ Clarence V. Joerndt, "St. Ignatius' Church Linked with Lincoln's Assassination," *The Aegis* (Bel Air), March 16, 1967.

⁴⁰ Robert G. Breen, "The Church That Cardinal Gibbons Loved," *The Sun* (Baltimore), February 6, 1952.

⁴¹ Mason, *Historical Sketches of Harford County*, p. 78.

⁴² Henry C. Forman, *Early Manor and Plantation Houses of Maryland* (Easton, 1934), p. 125.

buildings." Neither does the Bald Friar Knob placename refer to Father Neale or any other known clergyman. Dedicated men as they seem to have been, neither Bennett Neale nor John Digges have left any trace of their quiet ministrations, least of all a phrenological likeness in stone, not on this side of Paradise.

FRANK R. KENT'S OPPOSITION TO FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT AND THE NEW DEAL

By EUGENE W. GOLL

FRANK R. KENT, a widely read Maryland newspaper columnist of the early 1930's, opposed Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal. He symbolized those, who for varied reasons, criticized the President and his program of recovery and reform. During Roosevelt's first administration, Kent underwent a radical transformation. As a life-long Democrat, he initially supported Roosevelt, but by the end of the first term, he had become a staunch F.D.R. "hater." In his nationally syndicated column, Kent represented a conservatism which could not adjust to the quickened pace of change.

The great depression of the 1930's, with the New Deal as its solution, brought about an era of very rapid change in American life. There were a variety of reactions toward an administration which initiated so many alterations in the economic, political, and even social institutions of the nation. Seemingly, many improved their positions of material welfare as a result of New Deal programs, but at the same time, others rejected, resisted, and opposed the changes. In general, those who were opposed displayed their dissent primarily through a dialogue of criticism and made no sweeping rejection of the material benefits. As a result, these New Deal opponents precipitated no organized movements to tear up social security checks en masse or to refuse to place deposits in banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Among the voices of dissent was Frank Richardson Kent who began to lead the verbal barrage against the New Deal and President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He soon developed a "caustically anti-New Deal" attitude,¹ and many recognized him as a leading critic of the administration. A number of indi-

¹ George Wolfskill, *The Revolt of the Conservatives: A History of the American Liberty League: 1934-1940* (Boston, 1962), p. 215.

viduals respected Kent's negative thinking, and C. A. Rook, the president-editor of the *Pittsburgh Dispatch*, wrote to him: "And I am glad to tell you, all agree with you and are now Kent readers and Kent boosters."²

In his role as a critic of the New Deal, Kent presented his arguments with more substance than a Jouett Shouse or an Irenée du Pont.³ These two men were members of the American Liberty League's first administrative committee. They also had financial accumulations to oversee and to protect from the clutchings of New Deal legislation. Consequently, their opposition implied self-interest. A man such as Irenée du Pont made only a limited personal impact on the American people. His contributions helped more to finance the propaganda of the League, but he did not convey his thoughts to the nation.⁴

By contrast, Frank Kent manifested a more detached position of opposition to the Rooseveltian revolution. Albeit, as vice-president of the Baltimore Sunpapers, he was economically comfortable, but at the same time he was not in the same financial class as a Du Pont. His antagonism to the New Deal arose because it conflicted with his position on the political spectrum. He held and expressed conservative, and at times, reactionary opinions.

Compared to the industrialist or the financier, Kent presented more imposing credentials to qualify as a critic of Roosevelt and his policies. By the 1930's he had earned nation-wide fame as an astute political analyst. In November, 1918 Kent became a national figure by bringing back to the United States the first uncensored report of Allied friction in France. During the 1920's, Kent further bid for and obtained esteem as a person who was knowledgeable of the political scene by writing three books. They were *The Great Game of Politics*, *The History of the Democratic Party*, and *Political Behavior*. In 1923, using the title from one of his books, he named his column in the *Baltimore Sun*, "The Great Game of Politics."

This column afforded Kent the most extensive opportunity to voice his anti-New Deal viewpoint. In September, 1934, he

² C. A. Rook to Frank R. Kent, April 11, 1935, Frank R. Kent Papers, MS 182, Md. Hist. Soc. Hereafter cited as the Kent papers.

³ Wolfshill, *Revolt of Conservatives*, p. 60.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 63 and 65.



Frank R. Kent. 1877-1958. Sun Papers,
Baltimore.

nationally syndicated the column, and by May, 1936, it appeared in 130 papers.⁵ Many Republican newspapers printed his column; thus, the life-long Democrat gained admittance to Republican distribution.⁶

Kent personified a resistance to any acceleration of change in the United States. More than five decades of his life had passed before the New Deal came upon him. By that time, he could not adjust. The newspaperman maintained a political outlook which "might well have served as the model for Herbert Hoover's rugged individualism."⁷ Consequently, with a rather conservative viewpoint (or at least what was to become the conservative political philosophy) he attempted to grapple with what he seemed to feel was the unstable and fluid motions of the New Deal. And Kent quickly criticized those who tried to disrupt many of his cherished principles—the balanced budget,

⁵ Frank R. Kent to H. L. Mencken, May 25, 1936, Kent papers. In this letter, Kent insisted that many individuals persuaded him to syndicate "The Great Game of Politics."

⁶ Editorial in the Medford, Oregon *Medford Mail Tribune*, Sept. 24, 1936.

⁷ Washington, D.C. *Washington Star*, April 15, 1958 (Frank R. Kent's obituary).

limited spending by the federal government, and a small or limited government.

As a result, Kent verbally attacked those connected with the New Deal. Ultimately, the columnist found that it was necessary to go after Roosevelt himself, as the master of the New Deal. At that stage, he reached the point of personal bitterness which resulted in direct and biting attacks on the President. In the closing years of his life, Kent still nurtured and expressed an intense feeling toward Roosevelt. He wrote to Herbert Hoover in 1949 that his successor had been "vain, greedy, characterless, irresponsible, and slightly sinister."⁸ In public print, he approached, but did not quite present such an extreme view.

To the newspaperman it was Franklin D. Roosevelt who had betrayed Frank Kent. The President had committed the sin of fostering a dynamic political party, and under his leadership and sponsorship, the party had altered its policies in groping to meet the emergency. Unfortunately, the columnist, who had a profound loyalty for the Democratic party, became a vehement critic of its party's leader. Never before 1936 had he voted for a Republican candidate on the national level, but after that election, Alf Landon informed him of being "honored" to receive Kent's first Republican vote.⁹

In the 1932 election, however, Kent had remained true to his Democratic loyalties. To his readers in that year, Kent stated in the *Baltimore Sun* that Roosevelt provided the best hope for emerging from the crisis. In his analysis, he stated that Roosevelt's administration would be under "conservative influences" that would offer little opportunity for the "radical element" to emerge. Furthermore, only a conservative approach would be able to solve the existing conditions. He believed that the incoming President's only alternative was to carry on a program similar to those that Herbert Hoover had attempted, and that the influence of the "Wild Men" on Roosevelt would not exist.¹⁰ He also believed that a Democratic administration would be most certainly favorable to business.

Initially, with Roosevelt unifying his administration and embarking on a program to relieve the crisis, Kent supported

⁸ Frank R. Kent to Herbert Hoover, Oct. 14, 1949, Kent papers.

⁹ Alf Landon to Frank Kent, Dec. 17, 1936, *ibid.*

¹⁰ *Baltimore Sun*, Nov. 6, 1932.

and even gave his blessing to the administration. Gradually, however, Kent withdrew his support. By the end of the New Deal's first year, he held doubts about Roosevelt's program, but he still indicated some favor towards the President. But before too long, he was most emphatically to depart from this line of thought.

Up to the time of the inauguration, the columnist had continued to assure his readers that the incoming President would practice sound policies. The Democratic platform had called for a 25 per cent reduction in expenses. After all, Kent's friend Bernard Baruch had placed the provision in the platform, and it was therefore assumed that Roosevelt would adhere to it. He lulled his readers into believing that Roosevelt showed no weakening or altering of his views on the need for economy, a balanced budget, or the maintenance of "our orthodox sound-money standard."¹¹ Kent insisted that this was "in accord with Roosevelt's views and promises."¹²

But the speed of New Deal recovery measures caught the political analyst unprepared. He did not expect the broad, sweeping legislation that resulted from the "hundred days." After the passage of the Emergency Banking Relief Act, Kent reacted mildly. He conceded that when coupled with the Economy Act, the bill resulted in an "almost complete autocracy," but that this was a necessary condition. No one, he wrote, knew a better way out.¹³

When the Economy Act became law, the columnist leaped on the Roosevelt bandwagon and praised the man who kept his campaign promises.¹⁴ Here, Kent reached the high-water mark of approval for Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Dealers. From that point on, he reversed his support, and, in his words and actions, he went in the opposite direction. He never returned.

By April, 1933, the continued momentum and volume of national legislation disturbed Kent. He began to charge that Roosevelt had "outpaced" the Progressives, that the people were beginning to discover what big government really meant, and

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Jan. 26, 1933.

¹² *Ibid.*, Feb. 28, 1933.

¹³ *Ibid.*, March 12, 1933.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, April 7, 1933.

that Roosevelt's proposals were contrary to the principles of the Democratic party.¹⁵ One way in which Kent initially reacted to this dilemma of absolving party principles was to blame the "Brain Trust" surrounding the President. Professor Raymond Moley, while en route to the London Economic Conference, became an early target.¹⁶ Moreover, Kent felt that Professor Rexford Guy Tugwell was also a "very strong factor." The newspaperman displayed an apprehension toward his type of thinking and found little favor with Tugwell's planned economy concepts.¹⁷

At this point, however, as vice-president of the Sunpapers, he took another one of his lengthy vacations. He also continued to maintain a wait-and-see attitude regarding the activities in Washington. And in the fall of 1933, Kent resumed his analysis of governmental activities generally along the lines of a typically detached commentator. As yet, he had not started to attack the New Deal with a fervor whetted by personal antagonism. Instead, he stated that the New Deal would work, if the New Dealers would "change human nature and . . . repeal the law of supply and demand."¹⁸ Kent also admitted his doubts about the cost of the programs and the fact that they brought the government into so many different fields of "human endeavor."¹⁹

Nevertheless, despite questioning the constitutionality of many of the programs, Frank Kent still remained unable to make a personal attack on the President. On December 1, 1933, he suggested that Roosevelt "is the type who does not inspire bitterness" and that "no one will detest [him] . . . no matter what happens."²⁰ But as December progressed, a changing attitude toward the President became more evident. By Christmas of 1933, Kent became convinced that New Deal planners were working on a tax policy which would bring about a redistribution of wealth by soaking the rich.²¹ He also came to realize that the design of the administration was to appeal to the masses. Consequently, he felt that the National Recovery Act and the

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, April 11, 12, and 16, 1933.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, June 20 and 23, 1933.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, July 21 and 23, 1933.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Sept. 12, 1933.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Sept. 21-23 and Oct. 5, 1933.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Dec. 1, 1933.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Dec. 14, 1933.

Agricultural Adjustment Act had great appeal because of their basic principle centering around the "more-pay-and-less-work" thought.²² Kent's rugged individualism was piqued further at the prospect of the country's being "buoyed up by government money."²³ Then too, his concept of morality also suffered when imagining that the New Deal had "created a great class of beneficiaries" with its various welfare programs.²⁴

In February, 1934 Roosevelt's rebuff of Charles Lindbergh also upset Kent. When the young aviator objected to the army's taking over of the air mail routes, it bothered Kent to see the President so arbitrarily cancel the contracts and to treat one of the nation's leading heroes in such a manner.²⁵ Moreover, during the first week of March, the President gave his speech defending the National Recovery Administration and lashed out at the critics of the N.R.A. In doing so, Roosevelt crumbled a basic foundation of the newspaperman's life—the right of criticism. From that point on, no rapprochement was possible. Kent suddenly realized that throughout the nation, too few newspapermen and commentators were criticizing the President.²⁶

Henceforth, Kent's criticism became more severe. The columnist charged that the Democrats no longer stood for states' rights.²⁷ Moreover, he pointed out that the President was "switching to the heavy spending school." Kent felt that the influence of John Maynard Keynes and the "sagging of the A.A.A. and N.R.A. and the general situation" were responsible for the switch to heavy spending.²⁸ The attempt and struggle to bring Henry Ford's company into the N.R.A. further upset Kent.²⁹

In September, 1934, Kent syndicated nationally and became increasingly opposed to the New Deal. Consequently, he became a symbol of opposition throughout the entire nation. At this time, too, other influences piqued his conservative outlook.

²² *Ibid.*, Jan. 2, 1934.

²³ *Ibid.*, Jan. 11, 1934.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, Jan. 26, 1934.

²⁵ Frank R. Kent, *Without Gloves* (New York, 1934), p. 303.

²⁶ *Sun*, April 29, 1934.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, May 10, 1934.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, June 12, 1934.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, June 24, 1934.

Upton Sinclair's decision to run as a Democrat for governor of California, and his subsequent cordial reception at the White House troubled Kent, who thus saw a socialist hue around the New Deal.³⁰ In addition, the New Deal began to rile the crusading impulse in Kent. He had a very good knowledge of and dislike for many low political practices. By the fall of 1934, he felt that individuals connected with the New Deal utilized welfare programs for political ends.³¹ Moreover, Kent assessed the November, 1934 Congressional election results as a further "march to the left."³²

Early in 1935, Kent's animosity toward Roosevelt and the New Deal increased. Believing it to be an erroneous course of action, he intensified his opposition. Kent told his radio audience that more persons were out of work and on relief than there had been a year ago. Thus, the New Deal effected no progress.³³ Furthermore, he berated a fellow columnist, Walter Lippman, for supporting a program that was putting the country deeper into debt. Kent voiced no confidence in the President, and he questioned the President's stability.³⁴ The Maryland columnist also criticized Donald Richberg, the coordinator of Roosevelt's program and executive director of the National Emergency Council. That a "really intelligent man" like Richberg would attempt to "rivet . . . unsuccessful, unworkable, and unsound schemes upon the people," disgusted Kent.³⁵

*Increasingly, Kent found the goals of the New Deal repugnant to his ideals. His sense of political fair play suffered further when he felt that the administration used the weight of federal funds to force New York's Mayor La Guardia to fire Robert Moses. Moses held the position of Park Commissioner, and he had incurred the wrath of Roosevelt by running for governor of New York as a Republican, siding with Al Smith and criticizing the New Deal.*³⁶ Stepping up his personal attack on the President, Kent commented that this "showed Mr. Roosevelt

³⁰ *Ibid.*, Sept. 11 and 17, 1934.

³¹ *Ibid.*, Oct. 9, 1934.

³² *Ibid.*, Nov. 9, 1934.

³³ Copy of a radio broadcast on Baltimore station WFBR, Jan. 9, 1935, Kent papers.

³⁴ Frank R. Kent to Walter Lippman, Jan. 14, 1935, Kent papers.

³⁵ Frank R. Kent to Donald R. Richberg, Feb. 11, 1935, *ibid.*

³⁶ *Sun.*, Jan. 16 and 22, 1935.



Frank R. Kent. 1936. Sun Papers, Baltimore.

using his power to punish a man for personal and political reasons . . . in a . . . vindictive . . . course.”³⁷

Alert for further abuse of federal money, Kent paid close attention when Harold McGugin explained his defeat in the previous Congressional election of 1934. A Republican from Kansas, McGugin lost his seat in the House of Representatives. He told Kent that “Comrade Hopkins” caused his defeat by spending government funds to open “four meat canneries and two laundries” about “eight weeks before the election.” These establishments employed 2,600 persons which represented about 5,000 votes. McGugin lost by 2,000. To the receptive Kent, the ex-Congressman also revealed the story of Simon Fishman. In this case, the Department of Agriculture paid Fishman \$350 a month as an agricultural agent. However, he primarily functioned to champion the causes of Rooseveltian agricultural policies.³⁸

³⁷ *Ibid.*, March 13, 1935.

³⁸ Harold McGugin to Frank Kent, April 29, 1935, Kent papers. Also concerning Fishman see *Sun*, May 22, 1935.

Continuing to serve as a clearing agent for those upset at the "evils" of the administration, Kent learned of further abuses from a Southern publisher. W. S. Mudd told him of a deal between the administration and Carl Vinson of the House Naval Affairs Committee. In exchange for a vote that the President wanted, the administration held back federal funds from Georgia. In this manner, he maintained, they forced the anti-New Deal Governor Talmadge into building the Ball's Ferry Bridge in Vinson's district, an isolated part of the state. Mudd hurled at the administration the accusation of "government by bribery" and of attacks at "the very root of State's rights."³⁹

Simultaneously, while in his role as a critic, Kent became a mild advocate and coordinator of a defeat-the-New-Deal movement. In February, Henry B. Reiley, who published the *Somerset Herald* in Somerset, Pennsylvania, wrote to him suggesting a coalition between conservative Democrats and Republicans to nominate someone for the 1936 Presidential election.⁴⁰ Kent replied that it would be the best thing to do, and if those who opposed New Deal policies got together, they would comprise a majority.⁴¹ Further he heralded the view that so many "really want . . . a leader whom they can trust."⁴²

Moreover, the columnist tended to advocate a third party movement by suggesting to ex-Congressman Richard Aldrich of Rhode Island, that they join the forces of the "anti-New Dealers in one camp." Here the journalist unwittingly displayed much insight of himself when he explained that "the damned old party labels interfere."⁴³ He had established a pattern for himself; his devotion to the Democratic party blocked any complete change of allegiance. Kent befriended and supported many Republicans, but he was never able to call himself a Republican. Nonetheless, by Roosevelt's second administration, he was receiving praises for his writings from the Republican hierarchy.⁴⁴

³⁹ W. S. Mudd (president of the Rome, Georgia *News Tribune*) to Frank R. Kent, July 20, 1935, Kent papers.

⁴⁰ Henry B. Reiley to Frank Kent, Feb. 15, 1935, *ibid.*

⁴¹ Frank R. Kent to H. B. Reiley, Feb. 18, 1935, *ibid.*

⁴² *Sun*, March 6, 1935.

⁴³ Frank R. Kent to Richard Aldrich, March 29, 1935, Kent papers.

⁴⁴ Franklyn Waltman (Director of Publicity for the Republican National Committee) to Frank R. Kent, Dec. 3, 1938, *ibid.*

Moreover, he committed the extreme act of actually aiding the effort to elect Wilkie.⁴⁵ He never, however, accepted any label but a Democratic one.

On May 27, 1935, the Supreme Court invalidated the National Recovery Act. Kent rejoiced; the Supreme Court had upheld his belief in the Constitution. He reacted with new fervor when the President referred to the Court as having placed the nation back in the "horse and buggy" days. He feared that Roosevelt's advisors had deliberately "set out to set aside the court."⁴⁶ Moreover, he believed that the proposed "soak the rich" tax plan was politically timed. To him, it contained "the demagogic attempt to convince the little fellow that he is going to have a free ride and that the 'Fat Cats' will pay the whole bill."⁴⁷

By the closing months of 1935, the political analyst's distaste for the New Deal continued to increase. At the same time, his thinking also reflected a personal contempt for the lower level workingman of America. One such case which aroused his ire occurred when the farmers in Pinal and Maricopa counties of Arizona went without help during harvesting time, while the unemployed waited to accept the easier jobs on a projected W.P.A. project.⁴⁸ Kent felt that the "little guy" who owned something was opposed to the liberal and radical ideas of the New Deal.⁴⁹ In this case the "little guy" had \$100 in the bank or held an insurance policy which was worth \$1,000—no modest accomplishment for many of the unemployed in the 1930's.⁵⁰ As Kent's sympathy went no farther down the economic ladder, he could not comprehend the difficulties of those below this "little guy" on the economic scale.

Since he evidenced little concern for the workingman, the favorable attitude of the administration toward labor revealed another of Kent's ogres. He harbored a fear of and a dislike for labor. Obviously, he did not openly express this way of thinking in his public writings, but he did reveal his anti-labor

⁴⁵ Thomas R. Rudel (Representing Democrats for Wilkie) to Frank R. Kent, Sept. 30, 1940, *ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Sun*, June 4, 1937.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, June 29, 1935.

⁴⁸ Frank R. Kent, *Without Grease* (New York, 1936), p. 244.

⁴⁹ Frank R. Kent, "America is Conservative," *The American Mercury*, XXXVI (October, 1935), pp. 129-135.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

attitude to Gerard Swope, the chairman of the President's Commission on Industrial Relations.⁵¹ Kent also found it most irritating that John L. Lewis supported the President for re-election before the Republicans had even held their convention. In addition, he disliked Lewis' influence on the President in reference to the passage of the Wagner and Guffey Coal Acts.⁵²

The primary elections and national conventions forced out more extreme views. Both sides stepped up their attacks, and Kent did likewise. Increasing his determination to help cause the defeat of the man who had disregarded so many of Kent's views and principles, the newspaperman sharpened his antagonism towards Roosevelt. His antagonism narrowed his appraisal, and he charged that the federal welfare program continued to be a gigantic federal machine ready to promote the re-election of Roosevelt.⁵³ Kent interpreted the Maryland primary as a defeat for the New Deal. His reasoning was somewhat clouded in saying that the 95,550 votes for Roosevelt and the 17,377 for a Colonel Breckinridge was a blow to the President. Kent's point was that an unknown should not have done so well.⁵⁴

The heat of the pre-convention campaign encouraged the columnist to throw still another barb. He stressed more and more that the New Dealers featured class struggle in the campaign. As early as April, 1935, Kent quoted a pep talk of Harry Hopkins to Federal Emergency Relief Administration officials. According to Kent, Hopkins said, "If you don't know by this time that this is a fight between those who have nothing, and those who have something, you don't belong in the F.E.R.A."⁵⁵ A year later, Kent wrote that the 1936 election would be a clash between the "haves" and the "have-nots" as the New Deal philosophy encouraged class appeal.⁵⁶ He asserted that the New Dealers would "bank on the mental poverty of the voters" and "the potency of the appeal to class hatred."⁵⁷

⁵¹ Frank R. Kent to Gerard Swope, Dec. 8, 1938, Kent papers.

⁵² *Sun*, March 12, 1936.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, May 6, 1936.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, April 30, 1935.

⁵⁶ Frank R. Kent, "Prejudice Takes the Stump," *American Magazine*, CXXI (April, 1936), pp. 66-70.

⁵⁷ Frank R. Kent, "The Great Gullibility Test," *Life*, Vol. 103, no. 2614 (May, 1936), p. 22.

Continuing to denounce the administration, he intensified his attacks. Kent insisted that from the men who comprised the "so-called inner Administration circle" there "emanates far more hate to the square inch than is healthy . . . Mr. Roosevelt appears to have somewhat more than his full share." In addition, Kent considered the President's "frame of mind as punitive and vengeful." He also felt that Roosevelt harbored grudges against a large number of people who either opposed or criticized the Administration.⁵⁸

At the National Democratic Convention, Franklin D. Roosevelt's acceptance speech verified it all for Kent. On June 27, 1936 when in accepting re-nomination Roosevelt, leaving no holds barred, made his "War on Economic Royalists" speech, Kent quickly labeled it as "demagoguery" and "unworthy" of a President of the United States because of its emotional appeal.⁵⁹

As the campaign progressed, Kent desperately continued to want Roosevelt's defeat. Adding a new twist, the analyst concluded that it was a "recognized fact that the communist leaders are pro-Roosevelt." He surmised that there existed a similarity between it and the Farmer-Labor party.⁶⁰ Lawrence Sullivan, a Washington lawyer, encouraged this type of innuendo. Sullivan insisted that "From the outset, I have regarded Tugwell as the kingpin of the Communist influence shaping Roosevelt's mind from day to day."⁶¹

The election results of November, 1936 crushed Frank Kent. He had suspected that Roosevelt might win, but the fact that an overwhelming majority of American voters so completely rejected his viewpoint cast some question upon his political astuteness. Initially, Kent remained stunned and quiescent. Soon, however, he returned to the fight against the victor. Kent estimated that the million Negroes on relief who deserted the Republican party, the two-and-a-half million white relief workers, and the same number of federal jobholders, plus their families easily represented the ten million vote difference in the election.⁶²

⁵⁸ *Sun*, May 13, 1936.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, June 30, 1936.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, Sept. 10, 15, 23, and 27, 1936.

⁶¹ Lawrence Sullivan to Frank R. Kent, Sept. 30, 1936, Kent papers.

⁶² *Sun*, Nov. 11, 1936 and May 13, 1937.

With the increase in front-page news in 1937, the *Baltimore Sun* moved Kent's column, "The Great Game of Politics," to the middle of the paper, opposite the editorial page. As political and social forces moved more rapidly than Frank R. Kent, his rationale lessened. Kent's dislike for Roosevelt and the New Deal became even sharper. In 1938 he went so far as to contribute \$100 to help Senator Millard E. Tydings resist the Roosevelt "purge."⁶³ And, by 1939, Kent showed his loss of political acumen by wagering \$100 against the \$25 of Pennsylvania's Senator Joe Guffey that Franklin D. Roosevelt would not be re-nominated and re-elected.⁶⁴

⁶³ Millard E. Tydings to Frank R. Kent, June 28, 1938, Kent papers.

⁶⁴ Joe Guffey to Frank R. Kent, Aug. 8, 1939, *ibid.*

SIDELIGHTS

INSTRUCTIONS TO A TOBACCO FACTOR, 1725

Edited by RICHARD K. MACMASTER

THE factor or resident agent of a British mercantile firm was an important man in the economic life of the tobacco colonies. He purchased the planter's crop and sold him most of the cloth and manufactured goods that he needed. Only the wealthiest planters could afford to dispense with his services by dealing directly with British correspondents, or even influence the prices paid for produce and charged for finished goods. The prosperity of the average tobacco-grower depended largely on the tobacco factor.

The instructions sent by Joseph Aderton and Peter How, merchants of Whitehaven, England, to their factors on the Potomac in 1725 provide an insight into the business methods of tobacco factors in Maryland and Virginia at that time. They document some of the planters' complaints about the factors as well as the factors' own problems.

Whitehaven, a small port on the north-west coast of England, competed with Glasgow for the trade of the Chesapeake in the early eighteenth century. Richard Kelsick of Whitehaven began the town's tobacco trade with a series of successful voyages to Virginia in the last years of the seventeenth century. By 1712 merchants of Whitehaven imported 1,639,193 pounds of tobacco from Virginia and Maryland. They increased their annual imports to 4,419,218 pounds by 1740 and built up a considerable merchant fleet.¹

The early ventures of the Glasgow men were made in Whitehaven ships, and in 1722 a customs investigation showed that the bulk of Glasgow trade depended on vessels chartered from Whitehaven ship-owners. The instructions sent by Aderton and How refer to "some of our Towns Ships who lightend at Glasgow" as a likely means to secure passage back to Whitehaven.

The merchants of Whitehaven kept a considerable share of the tobacco trade, but steadily lost ground to their rivals on the Clyde. The town remained an important port, however, and in 1750 its

¹ Daniel Hay, *Whitehaven, A Short History* (Whitehaven, 1966), p. 27.

registered tonnage was greater than that of Bristol, Liverpool and Newcastle combined.²

As Whitehaven declined as a tobacco port, some of her merchants in the tobacco trade migrated to London. Joseph Aderton, one of the two authors of these instructions, apparently did so. The will of William Eilbeck in 1763 refers to tobacco debts due to John Aderton, son and executor of the late Joseph Aderton of London.³ From the accounts of John Aderton of Charles County, which were rendered by Colonel George Mason in 1768, it is known that Joseph Aderton died in 1755.⁴ John Aderton was not the only member of the Whitehaven family to be active in the tobacco trade in southern Maryland. Harry Piper, factor at Alexandria for the Whitehaven firm of Isaac Littledale and John Dixon, referred to "our countryman Jere Aderton," a dealer in convict servants at Port Tobacco, who advertised in the *Maryland Gazette* for cargoes of tobacco on consignment.⁵ Joseph Aderton, a surgeon, who resided near Port Tobacco may also be of this family.⁶

Peter How remained in Whitehaven and in 1740 ranked with Thomas Lutwidge and Richard Kelsick, Jr. as the town's leading merchants in the tobacco trade.⁷ How married Ann Walker of Whitehaven in 1729.⁸

Aderton and How chartered the *George*, a small vessel of fifty tons, built at Whitehaven in 1714, from John Fox and others. She sailed from Whitehaven for the Chesapeake, giving bond there on September 8, 1725. The *George* carried fifty-one parcels of goods from Great Britain and, in accordance with Aderton and How's instruc-

² *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29. Whitehaven's proportionate decline in the tobacco trade may be seen from the fact that of thirty-nine ships sailing from the Chesapeake in 1759 with an aggregate of 12,843 hogsheads, under convoy of H.M.S. *Lynn*, only three were bound for Whitehaven. *Maryland Gazette*, October 25, 1759, Feb. 28, 1760. Of 108 ships from the Chesapeake in 1761, convoyed by H.M.S. *Gosport*, including twenty-three for the West Indies, only six were bound for Whitehaven. *Maryland Gazette*, October 8, 1761.

³ Charles County Accounts, Liber 41 1765-1766, fols. 220 and 378. MdHR.

⁴ Charles County Accounts, Liber 42 1766-1768, fols. 212, 255 and 356. MdHR.

⁵ Harry Piper to Isaac Littledale and John Dixon, June 7, 1768. Harry Piper Letterbook, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville. Aderton advertised for freight for the *slow Aderton*, 200 tons, now lying at Baltimore. *Maryland Gazette*, December 14, 1769.

⁶ *Maryland Gazette*, March 16, 1769, August 17, 1769, April 5, 1770. The will of Jeremiah Adderton, gentleman of St. Mary's County in 1713 mentioned a son James and an unborn child. About 1738 Thomas Hussey Luckett conveyed to his daughter Anne and her husband Jeremiah Aderton land at "Chinquamuxon" in Charles County. Harry Wright Newman, *The Lucketts of Portobacco* (Washington, 1938), p. 74. The relationship between these individuals and the Adertons of Whitehaven is not clear.

⁷ Hay, *Whitehaven*, p. 28.

⁸ W. P. W. Phillemore, ed. *Cumberland Parish Registers* (London, 1910), I, p. 108.

tions, took on an additional cargo of 3,250 yards of linen in Ireland. She entered at Port South Potomac, a naval district embracing the entire Virginia shore of the Potomac River, on January 10, 1726.⁹

Apart from this customs record, there is no indication as to where the factors established their stores. The *George* cleared customs at Port South Potomac on July 11, 1726 and returned to Whitehaven laden with 171 hogsheads of tobacco and 2,500 staves.¹⁰

Edward Smith, one of the two factors sent out by Aderton and How on the *George*, is otherwise unidentifiable. William Eilbeck, the other factor, remained in America and became a prosperous merchant in Charles County, Maryland.

William Eilbeck was born about 1695, possibly at Gosforth, Cumberland, England, a village six miles south-east of Whitehaven.¹¹ Following his instructions "to fix at a place where they had the fewest goods last year," he may have established a store in Prince George's County on his arrival in 1726. In a deed dated March 26, 1729 Caleb Norris of Prince George's County sold land to William Eilbeck "of the same County."¹²

In 1729 or 1730 William Eilbeck married Sarah, daughter of John and Johanna Edgar of Prince George's County. The will of Johanna Edgar, probated in March 1731, mentioned William Eilbeck as her son-in-law and, among other bequests, excused him from the payment of 400 pounds of tobacco for "Storage," an indication that he conducted his business from the Edgar plantation.¹³ He had some business interests in Virginia, appearing as a creditor against the estate of John Linton of Prince William County in 1733.¹⁴

As Eilbeck's business prospered, he invested in lands along Mattawoman Creek, Charles County. In 1732 "Gosforth, formerly Clahammond," was patented to him on resurvey from escheat, and

⁹ Naval Officers' Returns, Virginia, C.O. 5/1442, fol. 14. Public Record Office, London.

¹⁰ Naval Officers' Returns, Virginia, C.O. 5/1442, fol. 26, Public Record Office, London.

¹¹ There were Eilbeck families in Gosforth and in nearby Irton in the seven-teen century. William Eilbeck and Margaret Dixon were married at Gosforth on June 18, 1691 and Robert Eilbeck married Mary More there on November 7, 1693. Phillemore, *Cumberland Parish Registers*, II, pp. 128-129. On the Eilbecks of Irton, see *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archeological Society*, 2nd series, X (1910), pp. 169-170. Jonathan Eilbeck of Whitehaven represented Eilbeck, Chambre and Ross at Norfolk, Virginia on the eve of the Revolution.

¹² Prince George's County Deeds, Liber M, fol. 396. MdHR. The editor is indebted to the Hon. W. Waverly Webb of the Prince George's County Circuit Court for this reference.

¹³ Prince George's County Wills, Liber T-D #1, fol. 190. MdHR.

¹⁴ John F. Dorman, ed., *Prince William County, Virginia. Will Book C 1734-1749*. (Washington, 1956), p. 27.

in 1734 he purchased 182 acres of "Ferne" from John Greaves. Through additional purchases, he consolidated a large tract. It was known in Eilbeck's lifetime as "Mattawoman" and in the nineteenth century became known as "Araby." Eilbeck's home at "Araby" is still standing and is now the home of Admiral and Mrs. Jack N. Fletcher.¹⁵

From his brother-in-law John Edgar, Eilbeck inherited lands known as "Wheeler's Purchase," "Long Acre," "Dent's Levels" and "The Horse Pen" in 1736.¹⁶ He developed this property as "Mount Eilbeck" and, as this tract ran along the Potomac, he most probably conducted his business there. This property is now called "Montrose Farm" and is the home of Mr. Maurice Flinn.

William Eilbeck died on July 26, 1764 in his 69th year and was buried on "Montrose Farm" near Bryan's Road, Charles County. In his will, dated July 2, 1763, William Eilbeck left his widow the use of all his lands in Charles County and the household furniture "at the plantation I now dwell on and at my Pomonkey Quarter" and bequeathed his lands in Prince George's County to his only child, Ann Eilbeck Mason, wife of Colonel George Mason of Gunston Hall, Fairfax County, Virginia.¹⁷ At her death in 1780, Sarah Edgar Eilbeck left the Charles County estates to her grandson William Mason.¹⁸

This letter of instructions also passed into the Mason family of Virginia. In 1962 the late Philip Dawson permitted the Library of Congress to microfilm a large collection of Mason family papers; among them was the letter from Aderton and How. The original manuscript remains in the possession of the Dawson family.

In editing the letter, care has been taken to preserve the spelling, punctuation and capitalization of the original, as far as possible. Where the sense demanded it, a full stop has been introduced in brackets. As the original is very badly worn at the edges and on the folds, certain words have been supplied on the basis of surviving letters. These interpolations are also bracketed. Superscript letters have been brought to the line and the word "and" substituted for the ampersand.

Whitehaven Sept. 23d. 1725

Messrs. Edward Smith and

Wm. Eilbeck. Gentlemen.

If you can conveniently call at the Isle of man, you are to take

¹⁵ Information from Mrs. Jack N. Fletcher.

¹⁶ Prince George's County Wills, Liber T-D #1, fol. 265. MdHR.

¹⁷ Testamentary Proceedings, Liber 41 1764-1766, fols. 220 and 378. MdHR.

¹⁸ Charles County Wills, Liber 7, fol. 582. MdHR.

in of Mr. Nash¹⁹ one hundred and fifty or two hundred gallons of my Brandy for the cargo, but if not, then take in about 40 or 50 gallons in Dublin, by debenture, and also if to be had without delay take in four or Six men Servants, which we will pay common freight for, [...] Servts. not only get ready Tob[acc]o. but engages subst[antial]; planters for their whole Crops [...] And when please God you arrive in Virga. you are to apply to Mr. Nelson²⁰ for advice, and then may exchange your brandy and the h[ogs]h[ea]d. of wine for rum, or draw bills for that liquor which cannot be wanted, endeavor to fix at a place where they had the fewest goods last year which will be in the Falls²¹ where Tobacco is readiest. Remember to lay handsomly on your Invoices—especially in Potomac (Rappahanock, you cannot have so high an advance) for the Common planters are better pleased to take goods at 100 p Cent when they have for Tobacco 20/- or 22/6 than when only 25 pr Cent, and Tobacco 14/- or 16/- pr hund[redweight]. But various men have various minds, and so have variety of invoices—and so write your invoices that by making different prices on same goods by splitting them in charging—those that you sell may either be of the highest or lowest price according to the capacity of the dealer and yet all by the invoice [...] Fix both stores at your arrival, at the most convenient places, and distances from one another, that no time may be lost in purchasing [...] And if a good substantial planter may want a small bill for laying out his Crop, do not loose a good quantity of Tobacco for the giving a £15 or £10 bill, or more according the largeness and goodness of his Crop. Likewise remember to give incurragement [to them] that prize their Tobacco.²² Pray endeavor to get the George [laden] as soon as possible and do not stand for trifles. [...]y you have purchased the gross of her Cargo, that she [...]n early Ship home—for thereon depends the [...]. Let Mr. Smith give charge to his mate to prize [...] you have two pair of good still-yards [...] the little pair let one receiver have and the other must find his owne, and fix the large pair at the Store so conveniently that [you] may weigh the hhds. as they come in, and by Complaining to your receivers sharply—by having Such a Check may make them give you the better end of the weights and likewise may weigh the hhds. when prisd., but then do not let the mate set the weights with

¹⁹ Evidently a correspondent of Aderton and How, but otherwise unidentified.

²⁰ Possibly Thomas Nelson (d. 1745), a Virginia merchant and a native of Penrith, Cumberland, with Whitehaven connections.

²¹ This word is unclear in the original.

²² Those who brought their tobacco already prized, i.e., packed into a hogshead by means of a prize.

chalk on the heads but keep the numbers and weight in a paper book.²³ You must take care to divide your Irish goods, and by assisting one another out of your stores with what you may each want, be a grate help, and likewise remember to divide such goods as were not divided here. Leave a letter with Mr. Nelson where you may think to settle that if we should send another Ship she may know where to find you.

And as we have a sent a very large Cargo with you in hopes of having the George early home (which by all means struggle for) and as soon as you have got the George laden, Then let William take the remainder of both Stores and go to the most likely place to purchase more Tobacco, leaving word where goes to, at the place where the George loaded [. . .] We shall give you advice if possible whether we send another Ship or not, but if not, then William to take freight home to this Town—if he can get any, if not, by some of our Towns Ships who lightend at Glasgow Oblidging them to deliver the Tobacco heare. If neither of these w[ill] [. . .] then freight it to London Consigned to Mr. Jerem[iah] [. . .] Mr. Richard Mowlinsons Merchants.²⁴ Let him be sure to get off all remains if possible [;] where the [. . .]m is unsortable and the planters wont deal, then let him give 1/- per Hundred more, then 5/- per hundred and so till the goods are sold, being they are of little value when they come home.²⁵ If William should meet with a handsome price, by good bills of Exchange, for what Tobacco he may purchase with the remains (provided he cannot get it freightd to this place) wou'd rather have him take it, then send it to London and Come himself with some of our neighbours.²⁶

Alarm the planters if possible and tell them Tobacco is fallen in England—and that there will be few Ships in this Year. And let none deliver any letters, unless you see them and that they may not be prejudicial to you, which sometimes does great harm. In

²³ Both Smith and Eilbeck evidently had assistant factors, whose duty was to receive and weigh the tobacco. Perhaps they were to be hired locally, as mates. The receivers mentioned in this passage could also be local tobacco inspectors.

²⁴ The Molleson family were active in the tobacco trade throughout the eighteenth century. Cf. *Maryland Gazette*, June 7, 1764. Several of the name appeared as members of London Guilds from 1688 on, but no specific identification of Richard Molleson or Mowlison has been found in either London parish registers or calendars of wills.

²⁵ William Eilbeck was to increase the price of tobacco given for goods, and thus indirectly lowered the price of the goods.

²⁶ If Eilbeck could not find a means of shipping the tobacco to Whitehaven, but could sell it to another merchant for bills of exchange at a good price, he was to do so.

case of the Death of either of you (which God forbid) we do empower Davy Bateman²⁷ to act as one of our Agents in all things.

We do not doubt of a good agreement amongst you and hartly wish you a Good Voyage. We are

Gentlemen, your H[um]ble Servts.

Jos. Aderton

Peter How

Be sure to write home on all Occations

Those goods if you think at any Time you leave too much of, then endeavor by all means to get them off and abate of their price, and those, if the planters run upon, raise the price on, to keep sortable as long as you can.

²⁷ The given name is conjectural, as the manuscript is nearly illegible. No positive identification of a Bateman in the employ of Aderton and How has been possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

PLAYS BY MARYLANDERS, 1870-1916

GALLY, DAVID B. and MARIE LAMBERT

When women rule; by D. B. Gally and M. Lambert. 9 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Aug. 10, 1914; D:37884; David B. Gally and Marie Lambert, Baltimore.

Plays © in other states - 1.

GALTON, MARY PYNE

Gone; a drama in 3 acts, adapted from the German of F. Friedrich, by Ryam Notlag [pseud. of M. P. Galton].

© Mary Pyne Galton, Baltimore; 1871:10172, Oct. 30.

GARLAND, ROBERT

Ames (The) affair; comedy in 1 act, by R. Garland. [2]. 24 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Oct. 14, 1912; D:31121; Robert Garland, Baltimore.

GARNELLA, ROBERT

Dramatic (A) treat; comedy sketch in 1 scene, by R. Garnella. 8 p. f°. Typewritten.

© Robert Garnella, Baltimore; D:1632, Mar. 21, 1902; 2c. Mar. 21, 1902.

Trolley (The) party; 3 act farcical comedy, by R. Garnella. 114 p. f°. Typewritten.

© Lewis Fields, Joseph Weber, Richard Garnella and Robert Garnella, Baltimore; 1895:58536, Nov. 20; 2c. Feb. 7, 1896.

Plays © in other states - 1.

GASSAWAY, ANDREW W.

Midnight o'er the hills of Judea; by A. W. Gassaway. 8 p. 32°. Printed.

© Nov. 27, 1909; 2 c. Nov. 30, 1909; D:17587; Andrew W. Gassaway, Baltimore.

GILDAY, CHARLES

Silver (The) queen; an original burlesque in 2 acts, by C. Gilday.

© Charles Gilday, Baltimore; 1883:20699, Nov. 9.

Plays © in other states - 3.

GILLIAM, EDWARD WINSLOW, M. D.

John Ruffin; a play in 4 acts, by E. W. Gilliam, M. D. 142 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© Edward Winslow Gilliam, Baltimore; 1893; 3989, Jan. 18; 2c. Jan. 24.

On the home stretch; drama in 4 acts with tableau, by E. W. Gilliam. [86] p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. July 1, 1913; D:33674; Edward Winslow Gilliam, Baltimore.

Pair (A) of valets; comedy in 4 acts, by E. W. Gilliam. 84 p. f°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Sept. 16, 1915; D:41764; Edward Winslow Gilliam, Baltimore.

Robert Burns; drama in 4 acts, by E. W. Gilliam. 63 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Feb. 4, 1910; D:20112; Edward Winslow Gilliam, Baltimore.

ibid; drama in 5 acts, by E. W. Gilliam, 62 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. May 24, 1912; D:29768; Edward Winslow Gilliam, Baltimore.

ibid; [Supplemental] preface and first act. 13 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Sept. 14, 1912; D:30934; Edward Winslow Gilliam, Baltimore.

ibid; [90] p. f°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Aug. 13, 1914; D:37839; Edward Winslow Gilliam, Baltimore.

GITTINGS, MRS. JAMES

By chance; a comedietta, adapted for private representation.

© Mrs. James Gittings, Baltimore; 1883; 5395, Mar. 23.

GOTTHOLD, CHARLES F. and GEORGE D. PARKER

For another's sin; a melodrama in 4 acts, by C. F. Gotthold and G. D. Parker. 61 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© Charles F. Gotthold and George D. Parker, Baltimore; D:7895, Jan. 25, 1906; 2c. Jan. 31, 1906.

Plays © in other states - 1.

GRATTAN, H. P.

Nobody's fortune; or, The convict's escape; a sensational drama in 3 acts, by H. P. Grattan.

© Mrs. H. P. Grattan, Baltimore; 1872:12919, Dec. 9.

Plays © in other states - 1.

GRAVES, C. L.

Sure; a sensational comedy in 3 acts and moving tableaux, by C. L. Graves.

© C. L. Graves, Baltimore; 1875:8159, Aug. 5.

Plays © in other states - 5.

GREENSFELDER, ELMER L.

Where there's a will; comedy in 3 acts, by E. L. Greensfelder. [1], 62 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Jan. 2, 1915; D:39278; Elmer L. Greensfelder, Baltimore.

GRIBBIN, JOSEPH T.

Square (A) game; sketch in 1 act, by J. T. Gribbin. 9 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Jan. 21, 1911; D:23222; Joseph T. Gribbin, Baltimore.

GRIEVES, JOHN

Who owns the baby; or, My wife won't let me, by J. Grievess. 33 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© John Grievess, Baltimore; D:9941, Feb. 11, 1907; 2c. Feb. 20, 1907.

Plays © in other states - 5.

GROSSI, ANGELO

Tourmaline (The); a fairy dramatic spectacle in 4 acts, by A. Grossi.

© Angelo Grossi, Baltimore; 1896:26206, Apr. 29.

GROSSI, ANGELO and AUGUSTE MARTIN

Elmir-al-omara; a fairy dramatic spectacle in 5 acts, by A. Grossi and A. Martin.

© Angelo Grossi and Auguste Martin, Baltimore; 1881:236, Jan. 6.

GURNNIP, GERTRUDE

Scourge (The); by G. Gurnnip.

© Gertrude Gurnnip, Glen Echo, Md.; D:2852, Jan. 12, 1903.

HADEL, A. K. See also HENDERSON, A. H.

Gold; a drama.

© A. K. Hadel, Baltimore; 1873:6344, June 5.

HAMMOND, MARIE ISABELLE

Geraldine; or, *Love and war*, a drama in 4 acts, by M. I. Hammond.

© Marie Isabelle Hammond, Baltimore; 1879:563, Jan. 13.

HAND, M. J. and ENOS R. BANKS

Acadia; or, *The Acadians*, opera in 3 acts, libretto by M. J. Hand and E. R. Banks, music by J. Carroll Chandler.

© M. J. Hand, Baltimore; 1893:37332, Aug. 12.

New Amsterdam; or, *The pipe plot*, an original American comic opera in 3 acts, libretto by M. J. Hand and E. R. Banks.

© M. J. Hand and Enos R. Banks, Baltimore; 1894:6509, Jan. 27.

HANSON, GEORGE W.

Avenging (The) son; by G. W. Hanson.

© George W. Hanson, Baltimore; 1881:11548, July 26.

HARRELL, CARRIE ELIZABETH

Honorable (The) Miss Stork; by Harold Ballagh (C. E. Harrell).

© Carrie Elizabeth Harrell, Baltimore; D:6084, Jan. 16, 1905.

VON HARTMANN, EMIL

Modern Africa; or, *The triumph of love*, by E. von Hartmann. Typewritten.

© Emil von Hartmann, Baltimore; 1893:8558, Feb. 14; 2c. June 14.

HAUGHTON, JOHN ALAN

Average (The); play in 1 act, by J. A. Haughton. [2], 28 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Aug. 16 1912; D:30551; John Alan Haughton, Baltimore. *Day of the funeral*; play in 1 act, by J. A. Haughton. [2], 14 p. 4°. Typewritten.

- © 1c. Apr. 17, 1916; D:43548; John Alan Haughton, Baltimore.
Rose of Mexico; play, by J. A. Haughton. 18 p. 4°. Typewritten.
 © 1c. Feb. 27, 1912; D:28852; John Alan Haughton, Baltimore.
 Plays © in other states - 2.

HAUGHTON, LOUISA COURTAULD OSBURNE

Dancing (The) Delilah; comic opera in 3 acts and 1 entr'acte, by L. S. O. Haughton. [4], 83 p. 4°. Typewritten. [Libretto only]

© 1c. Jan. 12, 1913; D:28294; Louisa Courtauld Osburne Haughton, Baltimore.

Decision (The); or, *The vacillations of Amelia*, sketch in 1 act, by L. C. O. Haughton. 12 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Feb. 10, 1912; D:28719; Louisa Courtauld Osburne Haughton, Baltimore.

HEALEY, JAMES BEAUREGARD, see O'KEEFFE, JAMES WILLIAM

HEINECK, ANITA

Prima (The) donna's ruse; sketch, by A. Heineck. 4 p. f°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Feb. 26, 1914; D:36170; Anita Heineck, Baltimore.

HENDERSON, ALBERT H. and WILLIAM C.

Black hand; or, *The Riff spiders*.

© Albert H. and William C. Henderson, Baltimore; 1873:4257, Apr. 22.

Mad (The) detective; or, *The girls of New York*, a drama.

© Albert H. and Wm. C. Henderson, Baltimore; 1873:5680, May 21.

HENDERSON, ALBERT H. and A. K. HADEL

Tracked through life; a drama.

© A. H. Henderson and A. K. Hadel, Baltimore; 1873:6345, June 5.

HENDERSON, WILLIAM C., see HENDERSON, ALBERT H.

HENRICI, ERNST

Charlotte Corday; trauerspiel in 5 aufzügen, von E. Henrici. [Baltimore, C. W. Schneidereith & sons, 1905]. viii p. 2 l, 149-229 p. 8°. ([E. Henrici's dramatische werke, IV])

© Ernst Henrici, Baltimore; D:6716, May 23, 1905; 2c. May 23, 1905.

Herostratos; by E. Henrici. Baltimore, 1904. p. 51-89. 8°. (E. Henrici's dramatische werke [no] 2).

© Ernst Henrici, Baltimore; D:5342, July 26, 1904; 2c. July 26, 1904.

Nausikaa; schauspiel in 5 akten, von E. Henrici [Baltimore, C. W. Schneidereith & sons, 1904]. 50 p. 8° ([Ernst Henrici's dramatische werke no. 1]).

© Ernst Henrici, Baltimore; D:5166, June 4, 1904; 2c. June 4, 1904.

HENSINGER, A. DELONG

Two (The) powers; by A. D. Hensinger. [43] p. f°. Type-written.

© 1c. Feb. 14, 1912; D:28692; A. Delong Hensinger, Baltimore.

HERZBERG, HENRY

Voice (The) of honor; a drama in 3 acts, by H. Herzberg.

© Henry Herzberg, Baltimore; 1897:40864, July 14.

Wooing (The) of the count; an allegorical comedy in 3 acts, by H. Herzberg.

© Henry Herzberg, Baltimore; 1897:30925, May 22.

HEWITT, J. H.

Woman (The) in the battle; a military drama in 5 acts, by J. H. Hewitt, Baltimore.

© L. J. Velasquez, United States; 1877:9405, Aug. 15.

HICKS, JOHN C.

Black cross; a sensational drama in 3 acts, by J. C. Hicks. Ms.

© John C. Hicks, Towson, Md.; 1886:14542, June 25; 1c. July 1.

HOBART, GEORGE V.

Her royal highness; a comic opera in 2 acts, by G. V. Hobart.

© George V. Hobart, Baltimore; 1898:76417, Dec. 28.

Sleepy (The) king; a comic opera in 2 acts, by G. V. Hobart.
© George V. Hobart, Baltimore; 1898:76416, Dec. 28.
Plays © in other states - 38.

HOLBEIN, W. A. J.

Under a mask; or, From dark to dawn, a drama in prologue and 3 acts, by W. A. J. Holbein.
© W. A. J. Holbein, Baltimore; 1874:590, Jan. 17.

HOOD, JOHN V.

Won by a lie; a drama in 4 acts, by J. V. Hood.
© John V. Wood, Baltimore; 1886:286, Jan. 5.
Plays © in other states - 1.

HOPKINS, ALFRED F.

Allies; play in 1 act, by A. F. Hopkins. 14 p. 4°. Typewritten.
© 1c. May 8, 1915; D:40602; Alfred F. Hopkins, Bethesda, Md.

HOPKINS, HENRY CLAYTON

Glamour (The) of love; opera in 3 acts, by H. C. Hopkins. 39 p. 4°. Typewritten. [Libretto only]
© 1c. Oct. 31, 1913; D:34905; Henry Clayton Hopkins, Baltimore.

HORST, BEN, see FAST, EDWARD G.

HOWARD, CHARLES

Uncle Remus; or, Brought to justice, an original drama in 3 acts, by C. Howard.
© Charles Howard, Baltimore; 1883:4706, Mar. 13.

HOWARD, GEORGE H.

Tyrrel; a tragedy in 5 acts, by G. H. Howard.
© George H. Howard, Baltimore; 1874:7073, May 23.
Plays © in other states - 12.

HOWE, DEN

Advance (The) agent; or, Her mother's last wish, 1 act playlet, by D. Howe. 11 p. 4°. Typewritten.
© 1c. Mar. 2, 1912; D:28919; Den Howe, Baltimore.
Plays © in other states - 7.

HOWELL, HARRY, see MCEWEN, ELINOR

IRWIN, HARRY CARTER

Conjuror Cupid; or, The legerdemain of love, a novelty comedy in 3 acts, by Harry Carter Irwin.

© H. C. Irwin, Baltimore; D9334, Oct. 27, 1906.

JACOBI, JOSEPH B. and JOHN JOSEPH MAXWELL

I'll tell my mother on you; or, The boy sleuth of Bugville, sketch in 1 act, by Joseph B. Jacobi and J. J. Maxwell, 12 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. June 22, 1914; D:37370; John Joseph Maxwell, Baltimore.

JAMES, BARTLETT B.

Sun (The) god; dramatic spectacle, by B. B. James. [2], 57 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Nov. 15, 1916; D:45505; Bartlett B. James, Baltimore.

JARDELLA, W. L. and W. ROSS MCKENLEY

End (The); or, The brother's wrong, a comedy-drama in 5 acts, by W. L. Jardella and W. R. McKenley.

© W. L. Jardella and W. Ross McKenley, Baltimore; 1880:8050, May 25.

JAXONE, JAY DUKE

Clue (The) of the crescent scar; comedy drama in 3 acts, by J. D. Jaxone. [90] p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Aug. 19, 1911; D:24987; J. Duke Jaxone, Govans, Md.

Doll (A) wife; comedy drama in 4 acts, by J. D. Jaxone. 87 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Sept. 12, 1910; D:22028; J. Duke Jaxone, Govans, Md.

If a miss must (marry); comedy in 3 acts, by J. D. Jaxone. [110] p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Aug. 19, 1911; D:24989; J. Duke Jaxone, Govans, Md.

Little Rags; comedy drama in 4 acts, by J. D. Jaxone. 87 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Sept. 6, 1910; D:21948; Jay Duke Jaxone, Govans, Md.

Texas (A) brownie; comedy drama in 3 acts, by J. D. Jaxone. 92 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Aug. 19, 1911; D:24988; J. Duke Jaxone, Govans, Md.
Plays © in other states - 6.

JELLEFF, CHARLES MARSHALL

Broken hearts; by C. M. Jelleff [sic].

© Charles Marshall Jelleff, Baltimore; D:8622, May 31, 1906.
Plays © in other states - 8.

JERROM, WILLIAM B.

Maurice Flint; or, *The secret compact*, a drama in 4 acts, dramatized for W. P. Wilson and W. A. Hall, by Wm. B. Jerrom.

© Wilson and Hall, Baltimore; 1874:3113, Mar. 14.

Woodburn; a drama in 5 acts, by William B. Jerrom.

© William B. Jerrom, Baltimore; 1873:4606, Apr. 28.

JEWETT, HUGH J.

Conquering Cupid; an operetta in 2 acts, by H. J. Jewett.

© Hugh J. Jewett, Harford County, Md.; D:12724, Apr. 10, 1908.

JOACHIMSEN, CAROLINE C.

Woman (A) who wins; a melodrama, by C. C. Joachimsen.

© Caroline C. Joachimsen, Baltimore; 1890:15984, May 15.

Plays © in other states - 1.

JONES, JULIA M.

Romaine; or, *Rescued from the grave*, by J. M. Jones.

© Julia M. Jones, Baltimore; 1895:53612, Oct. 21.

JONES, OLIVER HANDY, JR.

Fall (The) of Troy; by O. H. Jones, jr. 21 p. 8°. Typewritten.

© Oliver Handy Jones, jr., Baltimore; D:3165, Mar. 19, 1903;
2c. Apr. 9, 1903.

Honor (The) of a princess; by O. H. Jones, jr. 22 p. 8°. Type-written.

© Oliver Handy Jones, jr., Baltimore; D:2973, Feb. 10, 1903;
2c. Feb. 21, 1903.

Baltimore

(To be continued)

EDGAR HEYL

NOT IN SEMMES IV

Captain [Robert] Barclay of Ury—Agricultural Tour in the United States . . . 1842.

AGRICULTURAL TOUR | IN | THE UNITED STATES
| AND | UPPER CANADA, | WITH | MISCELLANEOUS
NOTICES. | BY | CAPTAIN BARCLAY | OF URY. | WIL-
LIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH, | AND 22,
PALL MALL, LONDON. | MD.CCCXLII.

Collation: (7 $\frac{1}{8}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ") : [πA^8], πB^4 , A-O^{8/4}, P⁴, Q², [R²].

Signing: \$1 signed.

Pagination: 104 leaves: pp. [i]-[v], vi, [vii], viii-xvii, [xviii]-[xix], xx-xxiii, [xxiv], [1], 2-158, [159]-[161], 162-181, [182]-[184].

Contents: p. [i] half-title AGRICULTURAL TOUR | IN THE | UNITED STATES., p. [ii] [beneath a rule] PRINTED BY JOHN STARK., p. [iii] title, p. [iv] blank, p. [v] To | THE RIGHT HONOURABLE | THE LORD PANMURE, . . . [signed, on p. vi: R. Barclay - Allardice], page [vii] PREFACE., p. [xviii] blank, p. [xix] CONTENTS, p. [xxiv] blank, p. [1] AGRICULTURAL TOUR | IN THE | UNITED STATES AND UPPER CANADA., followed by text, consisting of 14 chapters with headlines in capitals, through p. 158. p. [159] subtitle: APPENDIX., p. [160] blank, p. [161] APPENDIX | [rule] | DINNER | TO CAPTAIN BARCLAY OF URY, | AT STONEHAVEN., p. 181 [below a rule] PRINTED BY JOHN STARK, | OLD ASSEMBLY CLOSE, EDINBURGH., p. [182] blank, pp. [183]-[184] advertisements for "new works" published by Blackwood and Sons.

Binding: green or plum cloth blocked on front and back with conventional floral design in blind within two rules, the outer one $\frac{3}{8}$ " in width. Spine divided into five panels by blind rules. Binder's title in gold: CAPTAIN | BARCLAY'S | TOUR.

References: Sabin 3368, Howes B-132, 3 Clark 121. None mentions the integral advertisement leaf.

Notes: Barclay's mother was an Allardice heiress, and his father assumed the name upon marriage. An account of Barclay's life can be found in *DNB*, *s.v.* Allardice, where some of his celebrated pedestrian accomplishments are described. One

is alluded to in the dedication to the *Tour*: in 1802 Barclay walked 90 miles in 20 successive hours for a stake of 5000 guineas.

The Appendix describes a dinner tendered to Barclay in 1838 at the Glenury Distillery, Scotland, where 34 toasts, interspersed with pipe music, were drunk in the *vin du pays*.

Captain Barclay (as he evidently preferred to be known) came to North America in 1841 with a view to examining the state of agriculture in Canada and the United States. He first entered Maryland from the west. At "Haggerston" he remarked on the "strong and heavy" draft horses; and on the journey from Hagerstown to Frederick—in June—he commented on the equable temperatures "without any of that oppressive heat which I endured in Canada."

Barclay thought Baltimore, which he reached by railroad from Frederick, not notably different from "other large and wealthy towns in the Union." He was delighted with the Washington Monument and the "combined richness and magnificence of this scenery" he had viewed from its summit.

In keeping with his primary interest in agriculture, Barclay "drove out with the landlord of the hotel, Mr. Belzouver [George Beltzhoover, of the Fountain Inn, according to the Baltimore directories], to inspect a farm of 300 acres possessed by him, four miles from the city. This farm is well cultivated in the American manner, with wheat and Indian corn, and I found Mr. Belzouver, displaying as a farmer, more enterprize and tact than common, having imported several Durham cows and bulls, and possessing a herd of eighteen cows and heifers, partly reared by himself. As regards shape, breeding, and condition, they are the best I had yet seen in the States, and indeed, as to some of the animals, as good as are to be met with in any country."

It would have been un-British not to criticize, however; and Barclay was true to his heritage. Mr. Belzouver's farm displayed "an obvious deficiency in [animal] housing," though one not specified. It also appeared that "a great improvement in the productiveness of the land might be effected by a better system of husbandry." This improvement is likewise unspecified.

REVIEWS OF RECENT BOOKS

The Emergence of the New South, 1913-1945. By GEORGE B. TINDALL. Volume X of *A History of the South*, eds. Wendell Holmes Stephenson and E. Merton Coulter. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967. Pp. XV, 807. \$12.50.)

This large volume, on which the author spent twelve years in preparation, is the latest in the "History of the South" series, which had its inception some years ago. Geographically, Professor Tindall covers the eleven states that seceded from the Union plus Oklahoma and Kentucky.

The work, heavily documented from an almost infinite variety of sources, follows the course of Southern history through a period of checkered and complex developments in the life of the nation. It analyzes the internal forces at work in the South, the part that region played in national history and the impact of national developments upon the mores and thoughts of the region itself. Throughout the volume runs the theme of change and reaction to change. In the words of the author "When the postwar South of the 1920's surged into a strange new world of urban booms and farm distress, it entered an unfamiliar terrain of diversity and change in which there lurked a thousand threats to the older orthodoxies. A comparatively static society found itself suddenly caught up by changes that brought a mixture of hope and fear, of anticipation and nostalgia" (p. 184).

Considerable attention is devoted to the policies of Southern state governments. Those governments had implemented many of the ideas associated with the Progressive movement of the early part of the twentieth century and continued to accept the theory of greater responsibility of the state for the welfare of its citizens; there were times, however, especially in the twenties, when that responsibility was exercised in a fashion scarcely in harmony with Progressivism.

In thorough fashion, Professor Tindall explores the post World War I Klan movement and the anti-evolution crusade; the trials of agriculture and the problems incident to the rise of industry; the segregation question in its numerous ramifications; and especially literature, of which the South had become a vast repository by 1945.

The South receives extensive treatment in the national political field. The section was jubilant over the election of Wilson as presi-

dent in 1912 and, as a result of its considerable representation in his cabinet and of the holding of chairmanships of numerous committees in Congress by its representatives, played a major role in shaping the policies of his administrations. Southerners were prominent also in implementing the policies of Franklin Roosevelt, but not to the same extent as under Wilson. The author expresses a significant point as follows: "But if the influence of the South on the New Deal would be less than on the New Freedom, the impact of the New Deal on the South would be far greater" (p. 390). There follows an examination in great detail of the operation in the section of many measures passed by Congress during the 1930's, while treated in a somewhat more general way are the social and economic effects of World War II. Political reactions to Roosevelt receive due attention.

North-South relationships, sometimes friendly, sometimes unfriendly, constitute a recurring theme in the period covered. Operating in economic, political and psychological spheres, such relationships naturally produced mixed or contrasting reactions. In a book as exhaustive in character as this one, perhaps one should not ask for more light on specific points. The reviewer does wonder, however, why the account of the efforts to reunite the sectional branches of the Methodist church stopped with 1925, since reunion took place in 1939. Likewise, with respect to the freight rate controversy, the sectional angle might have been in clearer perspective, had there been an account of the several regional conferences of Northern governors in relation to that matter.

This volume is written in a scholarly and generally detached manner. If history is fundamentally an analysis of situations—a definition this reviewer accepts—then Professor Tindall, with his comprehensive and penetrating analysis of so many facets of Southern history, has achieved high rank as a historian. In an era where there are many controversies and differences of opinion, the author denies no one a hearing, although at times his own view of the matter under discussion is apparent. The only case, however, in which he seems to abandon restraint is in his manifestation of a hostile attitude toward those who were opposed to the teaching of the doctrine of evolution in the schools.

The exploration of twentieth century Southern literature is unusually good. No hue or tint of thought is omitted. Some of the writers are sectionalists and others are regionalists; some look to the past and others to the future, while at least a few look both ways.

Ohio State University

HENRY H. SIMMS

The Death of Slavery: The United States, 1837-65. By ELBERT B. SMITH. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967. Pp. viii, 225. Bibliographic essay, index. \$5.00.)

The author has presented a compact, chronological, and readable account of American political history covering the three decades prior to the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. As the title implies, emphasis is upon slavery and related factors as the nation moved toward and through secession and war.

Concerning schools of thought on the coming of the war, Smith suggests that "any study dealing with the coming of the American Civil War is certain to provide more unanswerable questions than unquestionable answers." He believes that the moral awakening concerning slavery has become strong enough in the North that it was one of the important factors in making the Union worth fighting for; that Nationalism had its strongest support in the Northwest; that "slavery as a social rather than an economic institution was the heart of the civilization Southerners were prepared to die for in 1861."

A man of political aspirations himself, Smith is intrigued by the intricacies of political maneuvering as the South, under the brilliant, but erratic leadership of John C. Calhoun, pushed ever closer to the brink of secession as it demanded first a government too weak to control slavery in the territories, then, ironically, a government strong enough and compliant enough to protect slavery in all territories even where nature and man were in agreement that slavery was unwarranted and undesirable.

Throughout most of the study the author remains aware of his commitment to present the coming of the war from the standpoint of the participant. The reader catches glimpses of the giants of the period—Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, John Q. Adams, Thomas Hart Benton, Stephen A. Douglas. Even President Taylor receives passing notice as a man who, like another slaveholding warrior-president, would have been glad to lead an army in defense of the Union. William Lloyd Garrison is given due but not particularly favorable credit for having scared the South. The Benton-Foote confrontation on the senate floor is related with some relish. Charles Sumner emerges as something less than a hero as Smith avers that "modern students of psychomatic illness would have understood [his] problems." With reference to Ben Wade's reputation with a squirrel rifle and his widely publicized willingness to accommodate any Southerner's yen for a duel, Smith suggests that "For some Southerners the prospect of a new Southern senate without Wade in it may have been a subconscious force working for secession."

When it comes to the decade preceding the war, Smith's respect for Stephen A. Douglas is pronounced. He suggests that the Southern radicals had to make demands bordering on the absurd in order to eliminate the only real leader of the United Democratic party at Charleston. He believes that this was a deliberate move; that by then "Secession had become a desperate emotional need for people who saw it as the only hope for guiding their future into paths that would justify their past and vindicate their present." He further contends that the resort to arms was a relief to some who were accustomed to settling their problems in the most direct manner.

This study takes its place as one of the Chicago History of American Civilization Series under the general editorship of Daniel J. Boorstin. A bibliographic essay provides a general survey of the literature of the era and the index is adequate for material treated. A list of important dates is helpful to the student not fully immersed in the period. It is perhaps unfair to criticize this general survey from the standpoint of one's special interest, but the reviewer would suggest that the contributions of the free Negro to the "death of slavery" during the entire thirty years was far more significant than could possibly be guessed from the recital of a few facts on the Negro during the war itself; it is handled in such a way that any treatment of the Negro at all takes on the appearance of an afterthought. It is to be hoped that a second edition will provide both a better integrated report on Negro efforts, and the clarification or correction of some facts.

The Death of Slavery should be especially useful for students seeking a survey analysis of the era ending in 1865.

Morgan State College

HOWARD H. BELL

The Rattling Chains, Slave Unrest and Revolt in the Antebellum South. By NICHOLAS HALASZ. (New York: David McKay Company, 1966. Pp. 274. \$4.95.)

Twenty-five years ago The Columbia University press published Herbert Aptheker's dissertation on *American Negro Slave Revolts*. Despite the author's political and economic biases and a tendency to overstate his case, most scholars have acknowledged that his book is the best one on the subject. *The Rattling Chains, Slave Unrest and Revolt in the Antebellum South* by a Hungarian journalist purports to investigate the same topic.

Halasz's book will not replace the earlier study. His essay is brief and sketchy; it will disappoint the scholar and be of little value to

the general reader. The book claims to probe slave unrest and revolts in the antebellum South, but actually it has no focus. The author comments on a variety of topics including slavery in the Americas, the constitutional aspects of slavery, sectionalism, and national politics in the nineteenth century. In some places the chronology is difficult to follow. Such well known episodes as the Gabriel and Denmark Vesey plots and the Nat Turner revolt receive almost chapter length treatment, although the author is not familiar with the writings of Richard C. Wade on the Vesey plot. There are chapters on David Walker, the New England Negro abolitionist, the slave uprising in Santo Domingo, and on the abolitionist movement.

Although the author frequently quotes from printed sources no specific citations are given; there is not a single footnote in the entire book. The ten page bibliography contains a number of careless errors. The names of two prominent historians, Charles S. Sydnor and Benjamin Quarles are misspelled; and Bell I. Wiley, the author of *Southern Negroes, 1861-1865*, is listed as I. W. Bell. *University of Richmond*

W. HARRISON DANIEL

The Freedmen's Bureau in South Carolina, 1865-1872. By MARTIN ABBOTT. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1967. Pp. viii, 162. \$5.00.)

The Civil War resolved some problems, to be sure, but it also gave rise to a host of new and equally perplexing ones. Foremost among the latter was the immediate question of what to do with 3,500,000 former slaves. The Emancipation Proclamation, Dr. Abbott writes, "had answered one question, that of the future of human bondage in America; but it had left unanswered another that was no less critical, that of the future place of the former bondsman in a free society."

In March, 1865, the U. S. Congress took the first full step in resolving this weighty issue by creating the Freedmen's Bureau. Controversy greeted this agency at its birth; widely divergent views of its usefulness still prevail. In this excellent and pathbreaking study, Abbott concentrates on the work of the Bureau in the oldest of the Confederate states. All too quickly it becomes obvious that, on both national and state levels, the Bureau suffered constantly from insufficient means for doing the tasks expected of it.

The Bureau lacked the personnel and funds for meeting the

pressing needs of freed slaves and destitute whites. At the close of 1865, the South Carolina branch had twenty-four assistants and twenty physicians to handle the exigencies of 400,000 freedmen alone. Of the state agency's chief administrators, neither the idealistic Rufus Saxton nor the realistic Robert K. Scott could effectively cope with inadequacies from within, plus congressional apathy, army resentment and white hostility from without. The Palmetto State branch did make some solid achievements: in 1867 its physicians treated 51,000 freedmen and 7,000 whites; in 1865-1868 the agency distributed almost 3,000,000 rations. Yet its supply was no match for the demand.

Abbott's study is an outgrowth of a doctoral dissertation at Emory University. The research is solid and the material fairly well organized. The author reaches his conclusions naturally and with commendable impartiality. While the Bureau was "a qualified failure," Abbott is quick to add: "The fault lies less with the Bureau than with the nation, whose conviction about total freedom for the former slaves was not matched by a courage and commitment great enough to insure it."

Virginia Polytechnic Institute

JAMES I. ROBERTSON, JR.

The Slagle Family in America, Descended from The Schlegel von Gottleben Family of Germany. (Baltimore: A. RUSSELL SLAGLE, 1967. Pp. ill, 184. \$7.50.)

In 1965 there appeared in *Senftenner Monatsblatt für Genealogie und Heraldik*, a comprehensive work by Karl Friedrich von Frank, under the title, *Schlegel von Gottleben*. Although few Americans could understand the German text, it was clear from the notations and photographs that here was a concise and well documented work. The present work is the English translation of *The Genealogy of The Schlegel von Gottleben Family in Germany*, by W. B. Marye and the late George A. Bingley; *The Genealogy of The Slagle Family in America*, by W. B. Marye and A. Russell Slagle; and the German text, all in one volume, handsomely printed and produced.

The family history is enhanced by a distinguished foreword by Mr. Bingley, and from this it is possible to appreciate the tremendous amount of work, professional in most cases, which went into the book. The result is a gratifying and excellent work, which should cause the compilers to be proud. The reviewer has seen at close hand eight of the thirty years' research carried out by Messrs.

Marye and Slagle, and can testify to the thoroughness of the compilation. The evidence is skillfully arranged, and no leading statement or fact is left without a source. It is a model to be followed by other genealogists.

Beginning with the grandfather of the wife of Ernst von Schlegel, who was born in the fifteenth century, there is an uninterrupted succession of births, marriages and deaths, extending from Germany to other countries and America, to the present day. There is much for Pennsylvania and Maryland genealogists in this fascinating and well documented work.

Maryland Historical Society

P. W. FILBY

The United States Army and Reconstruction, 1865-1877. By JAMES E. SEFTON. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967. Pp. xx, 284. \$8.00.)

In this tightly written book, Professor Sefton attempts to illuminate the role of the United States Army in the South during the Reconstruction years. He sketches the confusion and the problems that beset the Army in its attempts to cooperate with both President and Congress, on the one hand, and provisional authorities in the South on the other. The narrative concludes with the withdrawal of the last occupation troops in 1877.

Sefton's narrative is generally straightforward, but in this reader's opinion, he dips too often into material that tends to be anecdotal. Sefton touches upon, but fails to clarify or explain satisfactorily the stresses of post-war Army reorganization and its effects on Reconstruction duty in the South. On the brighter side, he does take various scholars to task for their misinterpretations of a variety of minor points: scholars such as Thomas and Hyman (often), Hessel-tine, Franklin, and McKittrick.

Much more important, in this day of constant reappraisal of Reconstruction history, is the fact that here is another exponent of the Rhodes and Dunning school. Sefton's pen has not damaged the old stereotypes, as his critiques of the military rulers and others make clear. Little effort has been spent analyzing military activities in the perspective of today's emphasis on civil rights. Perhaps a lively and penetrating conclusion is in order for this volume: something the few pages of "Retrospect" does not provide.

This topic is one that has needed exploration, and with this volume certainly a beginning has been made. The author's research has been reasonably thorough. If taken with some of the reserva-

tions noted above, the volume does make a contribution to the literature of Reconstruction.

Case Western Reserve University

ROBERT H. JONES

Forgotten Voices: Dissenting Southerners in an Age of Conformity.

Edited by CHARLES E. WYNES. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967. Pp. 138. \$4.50.)

Too few voices spoke on the Negro's behalf from 1885-1917 when the South capitulated to racism. Only the very secure, such as the authors of these seven essays—the established ministers (Thomas U. Dudley, Quincy Ewing, and Andrew Sledd), novelist George Washington Cable, history professor John Spencer Bassett, wealthy businessman Lewis Harvie Blair, and Populist politician Thomas E. Watson—could risk ostracism in calling attention to “alternatives” to racism. Watson and Blair later renounced their liberal views.

The essayists argue that not only is the continued enslavement of the Negro a denial of rightful citizenship but that it is degrading to the whole Southern population. Cable in “The Freedman's Case in Equity” (the lead and longest essay) contends that rigid segregation leads to equalization of the whites on one side and the Negroes on the other. The boldest essay is Ewing's “The Heart of the Race Problem,” which challenges white Southerners to define the ‘Negro problem.’ Ewing holds that that the Southern fallacy is regarding the Negro not as an alien (which has some justification) but as an inferior.

Wynes has provided a short introduction on the origins of racism after Reconstruction and ‘headnotes,’ which introduces each essayist. This book is an excellent judgment of what went wrong in Southern White-Negro relations, and for that matter, is a useful appraisal of the problem today.

Southern Illinois University

HARRY M. WARD

Ballots and Fence Rails: Reconstruction on the Lower Cape Fear.

By W. MCKEE EVANS. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1967. Pp. x, 314. \$7.50.)

Recent interest in the Reconstruction era is producing an increasing volume of general, state, and local studies. *Ballots and Fence Rails*, a winner of an American Association for State and Local History Manuscript Award, is an excellent addition to the growing list of revisionist monographs. Professor Evans, in limiting his study

to the eight counties of the lower Cape Fear area of North Carolina, presents a penetrating economic, social, and political analysis of the region and its people "caught in a moment of crisis."

Dominated by a planter society, the region was a stronghold of secessionist sentiment, and Wilmington, protected by Ft. Fisher, became a prosperous center for blockade running. But the destructive retreat of Confederate forces in the last remaining months of the war shattered this prosperity and left the region's economy paralyzed. Although the Piney Woods remained a source for economic revival, the rice plantations were a fatality of the war.

Paradoxically enough, Union sentiment was quick to assert itself in Wilmington. Instrumental in this had been the town's united hatred of General Bragg. In the early months of federal occupation General Joseph Hawley attempted to institute such Radical programs as land distribution, but this was quickly reversed with the appointment of General John Ames and Johnson's order that all lands were to be returned to their original owners. Under Ames Southern Conservatives temporarily regained their power. The Army and Northern sympathy supported them in their efforts to secure their property, but their use of violence and "Black Codes" brought about a reaction. With Congressional Reconstruction Conservative rule was struck down.

Professor Evans' analysis of the Republican party is penetrating and revealing. He rejects the older view of Negro domination of Reconstruction politics. Actually, the party, with its dependence on the White patron, never achieved stability but was subject to constant internecine warfare over patronage. These patrons made it a policy to play off the Negro leadership against itself, while the Republican program never attacked the concentration of economic power but was directed solely towards political equality. The Conservatives, on the other hand, made effective use of their economic position in the struggle for political control.

This very well written and researched book will delight the general reader and scholar alike. Professor Evans' presentation of peopling his book "with men and women instead of with abstractions" brings a vividness to his account which readily captures the interest of his reader. Not all will agree with his value judgments, but they certainly make for provocative reading. In addition there is included a valuable appendix which contains agricultural descriptions of the counties and other statistical data. Students of Reconstruction history will want to include *Ballots and Fence Rails* on their reading list.

Georgetown University

RICHARD R. DUNCAN

The National Waterway: A History of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, 1769-1965. By RALPH D. GRAY. (Urbana, Ill., University of Illinois Press. Pp. 258. \$8.95.)

This study is a significant addition to the fast growing shelf of histories of transportation of the nation. It not only is a fine story of an important canal, but it emphasizes how private, state and federal capital combined to create an enterprise some thirteen and a half miles long which proved exceedingly valuable both militarily and economically to three states and the nation. This was accomplished in spite of all manner of financial difficulties leading eventually to national purchase in 1919.

The material is logically organized and gleaned from interesting and varied sources both public and private. Following an introduction which gives a very clear resume plus generous acknowledgments, the first chapter, entitled "Connecting the Bays," discusses the dreams and plans of the colonial Thomas Gilpin and others for a waterway as early as the 1760's, long before the Canal Era. Actually, the company was not chartered until the 1790's, only to bog down over choice of route and the financing.

The Canal became a reality only when such national figures as Albert Gallatin, James A. Bayard, Mathew Carey and Benjamin Latrobe become involved in the company. The canal was completed in the 1822-29 period, at a total cost of \$2,250,000, or \$165,000 a mile, to which chapter four is devoted. As Hezekiah Miles said, then "This was a stupendous work," running between an arm of the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware River including four locks of 100 feet long by twenty-two feet wide, at the ends of which arms rose Delaware and Chesapeake cities.

From this point on, Gray relates, with clear and meaningful text including tables and illustrations, the account of the growth and problems of the Canal Company during its ninety years of existence. Interspersed throughout are contemporary accounts to add color and relieve the number monotony. The writer is able to stir a real sympathy in the reader when he describes the terrific financial struggle made by the corporation, through the rest of the period, resulting from moderate returns, loss of business to varied companies, law suits and officer defalcations. In spite of these serious drawbacks, the company remained to serve the public in both peace and war. In the Civil War, it was credited with helping to save Washington from seizure by the Confederates in 1861. The Wars brought greater revenue to the company too. The public seemed never to have lost confidence in the canal, for it was always able to

float new loans though it was rarely able to pay dividends.

Business was sufficient, following the above war, that the administration widened and deepened the canal providing, at the same time, better and faster service with barges. By the 1890's the company continued to have a large indebtedness and the earnings were not large enough to retire the debt and pay dividends. Soon afterwards the company became interested in selling the enterprise to the federal government. Meantime, both the state and federal governments had been studying the possibilities of improving our inland waterways and providing inland ship canals. The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal could easily become a part of a national waterway system. The job of convincing took a long time and necessitated the help of the Atlantic Deeper Waterway Association, the Angus Commission and many national leaders of the time. After an exhausting fight, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1919 included an appropriation for purchase of the canal.

The final chapter discusses the federal government's success in making the canal a profitable enterprise with a modernization program which continues through the current year.

This work is not only an expansion of a notable graduate thesis but also the editing is thorough. The volume, including its valuable bibliographical essays, sets a high standard indeed.

Washington and Lee University

CHARLES W. TURNER

The Upper House in Revolutionary America, 1763-1788. By JACKSON TURNER MAIN. (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967. Pp. xii, 311. \$7.50.)

This book is a compact, factually rich account of the legislative roles of the councils in pre-Revolutionary politics and state senates in post-Revolutionary governments. Readers of this journal will remember Professor Main's recent article, "Political Parties in Revolutionary Maryland . . ." and his numerous other publications on the relationship of wealth and power in Revolutionary America. This book is also concerned with that theme and stresses the social background, property, and social roles of councillors and senators.

The book consists of three distinct sections. The first studies the eleven pre-Revolutionary councils, four of them dominated to some extent by placemen (Georgia, the Carolinas, and Maryland), four by local elites (Virginia, New York, New Jersey, and New Hampshire, and three were elected (in Massachusetts by the lower house, in Rhode Island and Connecticut by the voters). Here Main traces

the political and institutional consequences of these types of selection, the income, family connections, and professional lives of the councillors. The Maryland Council was one of the most interesting and hardest to categorize. Its placemen, friends of the Calverts and of proprietary governors, held only a third of the seats but a preponderance of power within the Council as the rival Lloyd family faction shifted into opposition both against the proprietors and British authority.

Part two examines eleven post-Revolutionary senates. While these bodies were intended to thwart democratic excesses of the lower houses and embody aristocratic values, the senates became increasingly rent by the same factionalism that existed in the politics of each state. Part three attempts to draw together these two chronologically and thematically distinct discussions. It reports on contemporary thought about upper chambers and re-examines the debates about the federal Senate during the drafting and ratification of the Constitution.

Finally, part three compares the salient points of the preceding discussion of councils and senates in such a way as to show a progression, a partial transformation, in the role of upper houses from 1763-1788. By the early-nineteenth century, when the senates became "vehicles of party . . . the transformation of the councils was completed" (p. 243).

The book makes a substantial contribution to our knowledge of the political functions of upper houses, especially the councils. Apart from the elected councils, they defended the royal prerogative, but they were not simply static foes of the pre-Revolutionary movement. Nor had the rise of the lower houses eclipsed the councils completely. They continued throughout the pre-Revolutionary period to serve important legislative functions. The book is not concerned with the judicial and executive tasks of the councils because, as Main explains, those topics would require him to deal extensively with the causes of the Revolution. But his angle of vision on the legislative roles of the councils often shifts to include consideration of issues in pre-Revolutionary politics and social change in which the councils played a part. Unavoidably, the discussion of these peripheral matters is sketchy.

For example, Main concludes that the councils were not representative of the colonial aristocracy because, among other factors, they contained too many placemen in the Carolinas and Georgia and too many men who would become Loyalists or neutralists during the Revolution. Of course, earlier in the book he makes clear that a man's willingness to defend the Crown's prerogative power was only one qualification for elevation to the council and that a

prospective appointee's influence with a governor and with local leaders might also bring about his appointment.

What this analysis can only hint at—given the chosen scope of the book—and what we now need to seek is a more analytical knowledge of conservatism and Toryism in the councils. Which placemen-councillors were well established local officials with positive concepts of their responsibility and which were frightened cyphers? Which loyalist-councillors were attracted to a council seat by ambition to play a greater role in provincial affairs and then found themselves unwittingly compelled to defend the prerogative? Were there native born councillors who valued prerogative power fully as much as they did their influence in local affairs?

How did the weakness of the councils on the eve of the Revolution shape the way in which councillors perceived of their own dilemmas, and how did the nature of the councils thereby influence loyalist and neutralist motivation? "How dangerous it is to give private advice," shuddered New York councillor William Smith, Jr. after his suggestions to governor William Tryon had backfired during the Tea crisis; "Tryon will now think I animated him at the last Council Day to render him unpopular." "A place in Council is a kind of alienation," lamented South Carolina councillor Egerton Leigh, partly mocking that popular belief, partly grieving that it was true. Main's excellent analysis of the legislative work of the councils and of the social background of their members as well as his more sparing treatment of Revolutionary developments in which the Councils were involved will make his book an essential point of departure for a number of further investigations. Without this book, further research on the upper houses would remain badly impeded for years to come.

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

ROBERT M. CALHOON

BOOKS RECEIVED

- The Slave Ship Wanderer.* By HENDERSON WELLS. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1967. Pp. 107. \$5.00.
- The Supreme Court from Taft to Warren.* By ALPHEUS THOMAS MASON. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968. Pp. xv, 293. \$6.95.
- Founders and Frontiersmen.* Ed. by ROBERT G. FERRIS. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1967. Pp. xii, 410. \$3.00.
- Charles Cotesworth Pinckney.* By MARVIN R. ZAHNISER. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press (Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia), 1967. Pp. ix, 295. \$7.50.
- Untapped Sources and Research Opportunities in the Field of American Maritime History . . .* Mystic, Connecticut. The Marine Historical Association, Incorporated, 1968. Pp. 132. \$1.00.
- The New York State Historic Trust.* Albany, New York: New York State Conservation Department. Pp. 27.
- William Augustus Bowles.* By J. LEITCH WRIGHT, JR. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1967. Pp. viii, 211. \$6.95.
- Woodrow Wilson, The Early Years.* By GEORGE C. OSBORN. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1968. Pp. ix, 345. \$10.00.
- Castings from the Foundry Mold.* By HOMER L. CALKIN. Nashville, Tennessee: The Parthenon Press, 1968. Pp. 377. \$6.25.
- The Divided Society: Parties and Politics in England, 1694-1716.* Ed. by G. S. HOLMES & W. A. SPECK. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968. Pp. xii, 179. \$2.00 paper, \$5.00 cloth.
- The Reformation in England.* Ed. by A. G. DICKENS & DOROTHY

CARR. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968. Pp. viii, 167. \$2.00.

Man in the Everglades. By CHARLTON W. TEBEAU. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press, 1968. Pp. 192. \$2.95 paper. \$4.95 cloth.

Liberty and Authority. By LAWRENCE H. LEDER. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968. Pp. 167. \$5.50.

Rufus King, American Federalist. By ROBERT ERNST. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press (Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia), 1968. Pp. ix, 446. \$10.00.

The Methodist Publishing House. A History. Vol. I. By JAMES PENN PILKINGTON. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968. Pp. xv, 585. \$7.50.

NOTES AND QUERIES

The Manuscript Collections of The Maryland Historical Society—For over 100 years the Society has collected manuscripts and now possesses more than 1,700 collections containing approximately one million items.

Much of the material is vital to students of Maryland and American history and certainly a copy of this, the first analytical list of the Society's holdings ever to be published, will be essential to most libraries.

Approximately 375 pages, each collection is fully described and there is an extensive index. Binding is standard for reference books.

Available in July, 1968, the price is \$15.00 per copy. Please address your order to:

P. William Filby, Librarian

Maryland Arts Council—The Maryland Arts Council has announced that it will sponsor a juried art exhibition to select thirty works to travel throughout Maryland from June 9, 1968 through June 30, 1969 as a part of the 2nd annual "Maryland Artists Today . . . A Traveling Exhibition". Works will be juried by Dorothy Miller, Curator of Museum Collections, Museum of Modern Art, New York.

The show, consisting of sixty works in all, will first be exhibited at the Peale Museum in Baltimore from June 9 to June 30, 1968 and will then travel to the Washington County Museum of Fine Arts for the month of July. Subsequently, the exhibition will be divided into two segments of thirty works each and will be exhibited in galleries, colleges, libraries and other facilities in approximately twenty Maryland communities.

For further information, please contact Mr. Robert Marchand, Executive Director, Maryland Arts Council, 111 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

Invitation—The Committee for the Formation of a Carolina Society of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution cordially invites those who are interested to meet with them at the St. John's Masonic Lodge building in Wilmington, North Carolina on the second Friday in every month. Notices of the time and place of meetings will be sent to those who wish to have their names added to the mailing list. All correspondence should be addressed to Clarendon Plantation, Secretary of the Committee of Formation, Winnabow, North Carolina 28479.

The Carolina Society, when organized, will concern itself with

the publication of Revolutionary War papers such as the Dickinson papers in the possession of the Bureau of Archives, Trenton, New Jersey.

William Cumming, Frederick County, Maryland—I am interested in publishing the genealogical notes substantiating the "Table of Descendants of William Cumming" published by Montgomery Cumming in Washington, D.C., July 1, 1905. Copies of the lithographed chart are in the Maryland Historical Library, the Library of Congress and National DAR Library but without dates or places. Montgomery Cumming was the son of either William Henry Cumming and Elizabeth Reid McDowell or Montgomery Cumming and Rosalie Wade but no descendants are shown for either Montgomery. Collateral descendants in this line were Marion Nisbet Latta, Edward Dilworth Latta and Janet Acton Latta; also Harriet V., James Patrick, Mary Cuthbert and Claude Edward of the Houston family, children of Sarah Gilbert Cumming and James P. S. Houston. These records will clarify hundreds of old Maryland lines. Please send any information to:

Mrs. Newman H. Clark
5760 64th N.E.
Seattle, Washington 98105

COVER—The cover photograph for this issue is a bas relief by Lenore Thomas which decorates the Center School in Greenbelt, Maryland. This relief, which is dated 1937, is one of several sculptural pieces in the town which were sponsored by the W.P.A. Photograph by Raymond Faass.

The *Magazine* wishes to extend its appreciation to Mrs. Mary L. Wilkins of the Garden Library, Dumbarton Oaks, Mr. C. G. Vitek of the Baltimore Sun Papers, Father Joseph A. Haller, S.J. of Georgetown University, Mr. Stuart of the British Consulate and Mr. Raymond Faass for their assistance in providing the *Magazine* with graphic materials.

Contributors

EUGENE W. GOLL received his Master's degree from the University of Maryland and is currently an Assistant Professor of History at Luzerne County Community College in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.

LESLIE GENE HUNTER is a graduate student in history at the University of Arizona and is finishing the requirements for a doctor's degree.

RICHARD K. MACMASTER is a frequent contributor and is co-editor of the letters of Alexander Hamilton which have appeared in the *Magazine*.

JOHN W. MCGRAIN, JR. is a graduate of Loyola College, Baltimore. A student of local history he is senior editor at Tate Technical Service, Glen Burnie, Maryland. His article, "Priest Neale, His Mass House, and His Successors," appeared in the September, 1967 issue.

CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL

SINCE 1912 I have had the pleasure and responsibility of being an officer of the Maryland Historical Society, having served as Secretary, Vice President, President and Chairman of the governing Council. My duties as a lawyer, a corporate executive and a United States Senator for 12 years have not prevented my keeping in close touch with the Society and its growth.

For over 50 years we owned and occupied the Athenaeum Building at the corner of St. Paul and Saratoga Streets which was ample for our needs for some time. But since the business of historical societies is to collect, soon after the turn of the century we needed additional space. In 1919 Mrs. H. Irvine Keyser gave the Society a tremendous boost by buying the Enoch Pratt home at Park Avenue and Monument Street, renovating and enlarging it, and presenting it to the Society as a memorial to her husband. This generous gift resulted in our having larger headquarters, tasteful in design and well adapted to the needs of the Society for some years.

Until 1942 we could not afford a director, yet our small but hardworking staff functioned well. Fortunately we were able to supplement their efforts by the services of devoted and efficient volunteers to whom we owe a never-ending debt of gratitude. So effectively did staff and volunteers work that by mid-century the need for larger quarters again was acute.

Today we are rejoicing in our new Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, with its Jacob and Annita France Auditorium, giving us facilities made necessary by our continuing development. It is a beautiful, well-equipped addition, ideally suited for our services, now greatly in excess of what was required when our membership totaled only a few hundred and our endowment funds were almost non-existent. Now the Society can serve its members and the public infinitely better than we had dared hope even a few years ago. We are confident that our friends will give us the much-needed financial assistance required for our ever-expanding needs and services.

Development along such lines was prophesied and urged in 1951 by the distinguished scholar and philanthropist, Mr.

Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., when he addressed the members of the Society in a scholarly talk entitled "Expanding Fields for Historical Societies."

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, *Chairman of the Council*

THE PRESIDENT

The past year will always be memorable in the annals of the Society because of the completion and dedication of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building and the Jacob and Annita France Auditorium. These handsome and utilitarian additions to the Society's West Monument Street complex not only measurably increase its capability of serving the membership and the general public, but add dignity and stature to the cultural atmosphere of the community. The Society has deep reason to revere the memory of the generous donors.

I would be remiss if I failed to mention the long years of devoted service of George L. Radcliffe, past President and present Chairman of the Council, which culminated with this happy result.

Mr. Abbott Penniman, Chairman, and his coworkers on the Building Committee must also be thanked for their industry and devoted service in giving generously of their time and experience in following, on a day-by-day and brick-by-brick basis, the construction of the building. It is only fair to say that without Mr. Penniman's supervision and advice, the resulting structure could not have been so satisfactory. I am, therefore, pleased to report that Messrs. Penniman, Jencks and Hyde and Mrs. W. Wallace Symington, Jr. have consented to continue with their advice during the refurbishing of the Keyser Memorial Building now under way.

Appreciation must also be expressed for the work of the staff, the Gallery Committee, the Women's Committee, the Civil War Union Room Committee and the United Daughters of the Confederacy for their valuable assistance in occupying and furnishing the new building and in arranging attractive and informative displays.

The Library Committee has been especially industrious and, working in close cooperation with Mr. Filby, our talented

Librarian, has given wise guidance in improving and rationalizing the library and establishing the very efficient new Manuscripts Division.

We are grateful for the grant of the National Historical Publications Commission for a feasibility study as to the publication of the Latrobe papers, now being carried on by Dr. Paul Norton of the University of Massachusetts. Dr. Charles A. Barker, Chairman of the Publications Committee, was most instrumental in obtaining this grant.

The Maritime Committee under the able chairmanship of Mr. Richard H. Randall, Sr. has done a magnificent job in arranging the Society's extensive maritime collection. In this connection we also must express special thanks to Mr. R. Hammond Gibson who spent hours and days in lending his expertise in relocating and displaying the collection.

It is with regret that I must report the retirement of Miss Martha Bokel after 42 years of devoted service. We miss, and shall continue to miss, her very much.

WILLIAM BAXTER, *President*

THE DIRECTOR

I cannot adequately thank the members of the staff and of the several committees of the Society for their advice, assistance, cooperation and plain hard work during the strenuous months of expansion from the Keyser Memorial Building into the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building. I can only say that I am deeply grateful.

That much has been accomplished is evident from the accompanying reports. However, much remains to be done. On behalf of the Trustees of the Athenaeum, Mr. Abbott L. Peniman, Jr. has generously undertaken the supervision of the renovation of the Keyser Memorial Building. Under the leadership of Mr. P. W. Filby, Assistant Director and Librarian, the staff of the Manuscripts Division is pushing to completion a long envisioned guide to the manuscript holdings of the Society. Special exhibits for young people are not yet complete, and many refinements remain to be made. While the staff has been increased, highly desirable positions have not yet been

created. Clearly the Society must substantially increase its income.

Two events of the year will, it is believed, be of special benefit to the Society: 1) The establishment of an Executive Committee will facilitate administrative matters, and 2) the implementation of some of the suggestions contained in the survey of the Society made by Dr. Richmond D. Williams, Director of the Eleutherian Mills Historical Library.

Warm appreciation is extended to the many donors to the Society during the past year. It was especially gratifying to be able to restore a number of fine paintings and pieces of furniture. More such work is sorely needed; for example, the portrait of General John Stricker, commander of the Maryland Militia at the North Point phase of the Battle of Baltimore, by Charles B. King, is only one of several in extremely fragile condition.

HAROLD R. MANAKEE, *Director*

THE TREASURER

Following are the financial statements with the report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1967, of Arthur Young & Company, auditors for the Society:

Ten Light Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

The Board of Directors
Maryland Historical Society

We have examined the accompanying statement of assets, liabilities and fund balances of the Maryland Historical Society at September 30, 1967, and the related statement of revenues and expenditures and changes in fund balances for the year then ended, both prepared on the cash basis. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion, the statements mentioned above present fairly the assets, liabilities and fund balances of the Maryland Historical Society at September 30, 1967, revenues and expendi-

(Continued on page 220)

STATEMENT OF ASSETS, LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES

September 30, 1967

ASSETS	Total all funds	Current fund	Special fund	Restricted fund	Endowment fund
Cash:					
Cash on hand	\$ 150	\$ 150	\$	\$	\$
Operating cash accounts	6,055	6,055			
Restricted cash accounts	68,495	4,164	46,083	12,087	6,161
	<u>74,700</u>	<u>10,369</u>	<u>46,083</u>	<u>12,087</u>	<u>6,161</u>
Accounts receivable:					
Mercantile-Safe Deposit & Trust Company					
Thomas and Hugg Building maintenance fund (Note 2)	1,321,041	11,518		1,309,523	
Escrow accounts for 227 West Monument Street	2,125				2,125
Miscellaneous	1,243	1,243			
	<u>1,324,409</u>	<u>12,761</u>		<u>1,309,523</u>	<u>2,125</u>
Investments (Note 1):					
Stocks (market value—\$932,289)	556,516				556,516
Bonds (market value—325,376)	383,009				383,009
Mortgages	72,352				72,352
Ground rents	1,917				1,917

Real estate:					
214-216 Park Avenue	205,827				205,827
227 West Monument Street	102,230				102,230
Less accumulated depreciation on buildings	(2,209)				(2,209)
Net real estate	305,848				305,848
	1,319,642				1,319,642
Property, plant and equipment, at cost (Notes 1 and 2) :					
Land and buildings	2,055,065	118,614			1,936,451
Furniture and equipment	38,970	5,168			33,802
Books	1	1			
Manuscripts	1	1			
Paintings and statuary	1	1			
	2,094,038	123,785			1,970,253
Interfund balances—net	—	(84,139)	2,311	1,625	80,203
Total assets	\$4,812,789	\$ 62,776	\$ 48,394	\$1,323,235	\$3,378,384
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES					
Accounts payable	\$ 133	\$ 133	\$	\$	\$
Payroll taxes withheld	2,399	2,399			
6½% mortgage note payable, due \$3,000 annually	48,500				48,500
Reserve for Latrobe Papers' repair fund	553	553			
Fund balances	4,761,204	59,691	48,394	1,323,235	3,329,884
Total liabilities and fund balances	\$4,812,789	\$ 62,776	\$ 48,394	\$1,323,235	\$3,378,384

STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES

Year ended September 30, 1967

	Total all funds	Operating fund	Special fund	Restricted fund	Endowment fund
Revenues:					
Dues and contributions	\$2,975,255	\$ 33,264	\$ 7,077	\$1,338,146	\$1,596,768
Sales and service fees	39,765	9,817	28,314	1,634	
State of Maryland programs	31,618	31,618			
Investments	84,655	71,798	973		11,884
Other	1,004	1,004			
Thomas and Hugg Operational Transfer	—	28,623		(28,623)	
	<u>3,132,297</u>	<u>176,124</u>	<u>36,364</u>	<u>1,311,157</u>	<u>1,608,652</u>
Expenditures:					
Personnel expenditures	114,527	114,527			
Service operations	60,218	20,753	36,286	3,179	
Building operations	21,486	21,486			
General operations	16,082	16,082			
Investment expenditures	17,964	5,320			12,644
	<u>230,277</u>	<u>178,168</u>	<u>36,286</u>	<u>3,179</u>	<u>12,644</u>
Excess of revenues over expenditures (expenditures over revenues)	2,902,020	(2,044)	78	1,307,978	1,596,008
Fund balance at beginning of year	1,859,184	61,735	48,316	15,257	1,733,876
Fund balance at end of year	<u>\$4,761,204</u>	<u>\$ 59,691</u>	<u>\$ 48,394</u>	<u>\$1,323,235</u>	<u>\$3,329,884</u>

1. *Basis of presentation*

The Society's accounts are maintained on the basis of cash received and disbursed.

Expenditures for books and publications are charged to expense in the year paid and no adjustment is made for inventory. Land and buildings have been capitalized at cost and no provision has been made for depreciation with the exception of certain buildings held for investment, which are being depreciated over their estimated useful lives.

Commencing in the year ended September 30, 1967, all items of furniture and equipment acquired by the Society have been capitalized. No provision has been made for depreciation on these assets.

Books, manuscripts, prints, paintings and stationery donated to or acquired by the Society are carried on the books at a nominal value.

Investments are valued at cost or at market value at date of donation.

2. *Gift from John L. and William S. Thomas*

Funds for the construction of the Society's new facilities were provided from the trust set up under the wills of John L. and William S. Thomas. The wills also provide for a gift to the Society of the residue of the estate for the maintenance of the new building. While the trustee, the Mercantile-Safe Deposit and Trust Company will retain legal possession of the estate assets until the building is finally accepted by the Society, because of the Society's substantial completion of all requirements of the will and its constructive acceptance of the building, the gift has been recorded in the current year.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION
REVENUES
Year ended September 30, 1967

	Total	Operating fund	Special fund	Restricted fund	Endowment fund
Dues and contributions:					
Dues	\$ 26,371	\$ 26,371	\$	\$	\$
Contributions:					
Miscellaneous	19,368	6,893	7,077		5,398
Thomas brothers' legacy	2,929,516			1,338,146	1,591,370
	<u>2,975,255</u>	<u>33,264</u>	<u>7,077</u>	<u>1,338,146</u>	<u>1,596,768</u>
Sales and service fees:					
Sales of magazines and history notes	3,359	3,359			
Sales of books	29,936	2,034	26,268	1,634	
Library service fees	4,424	4,424			
Other sales	2,046		2,046		
	<u>39,765</u>	<u>9,817</u>	<u>28,314</u>	<u>1,634</u>	

State of Maryland programs:

State programs	16,300	16,300
Archives transfer from restricted fund	6,500	6,500
State indexing	5,000	5,000
Magazine indexing	3,818	3,818
	<u>31,618</u>	<u>31,618</u>

Investments:

Dividends and sales of rights	33,653	33,561		92
Interest	25,743	24,770	973	
Trust fund	2,534	2,534		
Real estate	22,725	10,933		11,792
	<u>84,655</u>	<u>71,798</u>	<u>973</u>	<u>11,884</u>

Other income

Thomas and Hugg operational transfer

Other income	1,004	1,004		
Thomas and Hugg operational transfer		28,623	(28,623)	
	<u>\$3,132,297</u>	<u>\$ 176,124</u>	<u>\$ 36,364</u>	<u>\$1,311,157</u>
				<u>\$1,608,652</u>

EXPENDITURES
Year ended September 30, 1967

	Total	Operating fund	Special fund	Restricted fund	Endowment fund
Personnel expenditures:					
Salaries	\$102,574	\$102,574	\$	\$	\$
Social security taxes	3,614	3,614			
Contribution to pension plan	4,866	4,866			
Voluntary pension payments	3,473	3,473			
	<u>114,527</u>	<u>114,527</u>			
Service operations:					
Publication and binding charges	26,722	15,775	7,768	3,179	
Purchase of roadmarker plaques	1,446	1,446			
Purchase of books	14,159	3,197	10,962		
Restoration funds	14,874		14,874		
Special projects	2,682		2,682		
Membership extension	335	335			
	<u>60,218</u>	<u>20,753</u>	<u>36,286</u>	<u>3,179</u>	
Building operations:					
Maintenance, repairs and supplies	3,611	3,611			
Light, heat and water	6,378	6,378			
Telephone	2,332	2,332			
Insurance	2,980	2,980			
Temporary cost associated with construction	4,864	4,864			
ADT	1,321	1,321			
	<u>21,486</u>	<u>21,486</u>			

General operations:

Supplies	7,368	7,368
Postage and addresses	1,736	1,736
Staff expenses—parking and travel	2,982	2,982
Legal and audit	1,302	1,302
Williams survey	731	731
Xerox charges	1,963	1,963
	<u>16,082</u>	<u>16,082</u>

Investment expenditures:

Property taxes	5,923	1,846		4,077
Interest on mortgage	1,613			1,613
Management commissions	1,179			1,179
Utilities	971			971
Insurance	658			658
Transfer tax	500			500
Repairs and maintenance	384			384
Depreciation	2,209			2,209
Bank commissions	4,527	3,474		1,053
	<u>17,964</u>	<u>5,320</u>		<u>12,644</u>
	<u>\$230,277</u>	<u>\$178,168</u>	<u>\$ 36,286</u>	<u>\$ 3,179</u>
				<u>\$ 12,644</u>

SAMUEL HOPKINS, *Treasurer*

tures and the changes in fund balances for the year then ended, on the cash basis consistent with that of the preceding year except for the change in accounting for furniture and equipment as described in Note 1 to the financial statements.

The accompanying supplementary information has been subjected to the tests and other auditing procedures applied in the examination of the financial statements mentioned above and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all respects material in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

November 10, 1967

ARTHUR YOUNG & COMPANY

COMMITTEE ON THE GALLERY

Despite the fact that the gallery and museum staff were among those primarily concerned with the occupation of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, its members were able to make loans to the Detroit Institute of Art, the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, the Peale Museum, the Talbot County Historical Society, Easton; Hampton Mansion, Towson; the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; and, locally, to the Enoch Pratt Free Library, the Walters Art Gallery and the Baltimore Museum of Art.

During the same period loans were recalled from the Chesapeake Bay Maritime Museum, St. Michaels; the Washington County Museum of Fine Arts, Hagerstown; the Baltimore Museum of Art; and other institutions which generously had housed and displayed substantial quantities of the Society's paintings and furniture during the construction of the new building.

The laborious wrapping, boxing and labeling of hundreds of items in preparation for the move was ably accomplished by Mrs. Virginia Swarm, Registrar, assisted by Mrs. Enolliah Brown and Mrs. Janet Waddy, housekeepers.

Through the interest of the Council and the generosity of Miss Elizabeth W. Baker, Mrs. Harry Clark Boden, the Society of the *Ark* and the *Dove*, and the Misses Ingle, a number of paintings were fully restored, and a greater number underwent minor repairs and freshening. Many pieces of furniture were refurbished, and numerous new display cases were purchased.

Notwithstanding this heavy work load, two new projects were undertaken. Assisted by Mrs. Clyde Loose, Miss Eugenia Holland, Assistant Curator, began updating the ownership file of the portraits listed in the *J. Hall Pleasants Studies in Maryland Painting*. Miss Holland also has virtually completed a checklist of Maryland clockmakers, with biographical material accompanying most entries. It is hoped that funds will be found to publish the list and that similar compilations can be made of other Maryland craftsmen. Mr. Robert McCauley of Bethesda merits special thanks for refurbishing the Society's sword collection and installing it in display cases.

The Society acknowledges with gratitude a gift from Stewart & Co. of seven mannequins. These, together with two donated by Miss Amy Greif and several others which were purchased, permitted a much larger display of the Society's costume collection than has been previously possible. The Society also gratefully acknowledges the valuable help of Mr. Robert Zimmerman and Miss Cynthia Ludlow of the Baltimore Museum of Art, and Mr. Noel Carriere in arranging displays in the new building. Acknowledgments of gifts have been noted in *Maryland History Notes* as received.

During the year the staff attended a number of meetings at which aspects of conservation were discussed. Miss Holland attended the Antiques Forum at Williamsburg in January and served on a committee to furnish the newly restored Carroll-Caton House.

FRANCIS H. JENCKS, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

After having been closed since June 1, 1966, to all but scholars faced with publication deadlines, the library doors reopened on April 1, 1967. In those ten months the staff accomplished much. Scarcely a manuscript remained untouched, and by the time that readers were readmitted, well over 1,000,000 documents had been moved. One full-time and one part-time manuscript librarians were appointed, and much new equipment was purchased. As a result the library has attained a new level of efficiency.

Readers

From April 1 to December 31, 1967, there were approximately 2,500 readers. Genealogists outnumbered historical researchers about three to one. Of those who signed the register, 258 were members. Bona fide students of history were allowed free access at all times, and non-members paid a daily fee of \$1. The receipts of \$225 were used to restore genealogical materials. While the number of visitors to the library showed no appreciable increase, telephone calls and correspondence became markedly heavier than in 1966, necessitating the employment of additional typists. Much of the correspondence came from genealogists, and since this entailed research, a minimum fee of \$2 was introduced for name checking, but prolonged genealogical research is still impossible.

Personnel

During 1967 Mrs. Timothy Pedley continued her work on the manuscripts project, and Miss Bayly Ellen Marks became Curator, freeing Mrs. Pedley to edit the *Guide to the Manuscripts*. Mrs. Pedley left in November, but continued her editing at home. Mrs. Laura Bard, a summer employee, spent most of her time on the Scharf Papers. Miss Nancy Schneider joined the manuscripts staff, as did Mr. Walter Clayton and Mr. James Graham as part-time assistants. Mr. Charles Ayres, after two years of unremitting industry, left to join the army.

Mrs. Forrest Lord retired after 15 years of exceptional work, and Miss Kathleen Reinsfelder continued as secretary to the Librarian. Mrs. Jutta Allnutt and Mr. David Paulson were employed part-time so that correspondence could be answered promptly. To assist with typing during the summer Miss Joyce Helfrich was employed. Mr. James Cabezas continued in the printed books section, and was joined by Mr. Charles Burman and Mr. Frank DelVecchio. Mr. Thomas Eader left to join the Peale Museum and was replaced by Mrs. Mary K. Meyer, a professional genealogist. Mr. Henry Klingel occupied the new reference post from March until August. Mrs. Robert H. McCauley, Jr., who had commuted from Bethesda to assist in the cataloging of manuscripts in a voluntary capacity, was employed by the Historical Society of Harford County to reorganize the 36,000 items in its collection which is housed at

the Society. In September she joined the staff full time, and since has become Curator of Graphics.

The library relies heavily on the generosity and skill of volunteers. The Dielman Biographical File has been continued by Miss Mary C. Hiss, assisted by Miss Eliza Funk, Miss Jessie Slee, Miss Florence Kelly and Mesdames C. W. Ayres, G. W. Cauthorn, and Biays S. Bowerman. Mrs. Bowerman checked rare pamphlets against holdings, and aided in preliminary cataloging. Miss Madeleine Wells helped in mounting clippings. Miss Selma Grether, docent, maintained the subject files, assisted by Miss Louisa Gary and Mrs. B. Frank Newcomer.

Miss Betty Adler continued her preparation of the cumulative index of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, completing volumes 42-48, inclusive. Additional editorial tasks connected with this project, such as filing cards and elucidating specific questions posed by Miss Adler, could not be undertaken by the Society's staff at this time.

The annual index to the *Magazine* was prepared by Mr. Frank F. White, Jr., and entries for the Society's existing file were entered in the *Magazine* card index by Miss Wells.

General Staff Activities

The increase in staff has permitted the allotment of personnel to specific tasks:

(a) *Manuscripts*. The tremendous task begun by the staff in 1966 and described in last year's annual report, was completed early in 1967, when the last of the 1,700 collections was cataloged for inclusion in the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections*. Mrs. Pedley then began compiling the subject index, and preparing the text for the *Guide to the Manuscript Collections of the Maryland Historical Society*. The *Guide* will consist of about 500 pages describing all collections and will include a copious index. It should be available by June, 1968, and will mark one of the most important steps in the history of the manuscripts collection. Meanwhile the staff has kept abreast of new collections, so that catalog forms are completed within a few days of receipt. Indexing continues, but with the enormous backlog of unindexed manuscripts plus the 7,000 received in 1967, the work will take many years. Most of the Scharf Papers (MS. 1999), all of the Carroll-Harper Col-

lection (MS. 1225), and portions of the Falconar Papers (MS. 345.1), were indexed. A sustained effort is being made on the Lloyd Papers (M.S. 2001).

Some manuscripts were in need of repair and restoration, and professional advice has resulted in almost all of them having been placed in acid-free boxes. Thus acid migration has been delayed, although much remains to be done. Funds for the restoration of manuscript collections and books were generously provided by the Maryland Chapter, Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America, the Society of Daughters of Colonial Wars in the State of Maryland, and the Society of the War of 1812.

Funds are urgently needed for the restoration of the Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton Papers (MS. 206). Deterioration has meant that the papers have had to be deacidified, and in some cases, laminated, at a cost of \$1,500. Much new equipment, including a microfilm reader printer and a Xerox 914, has enabled readers to work as conveniently as in other modern institutions.

Maryland Diocesan Manuscripts

The Maryland Diocesan manuscripts and related printed matter concerning the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland were deposited in the Society on July 18, 1967, by the Diocese of Maryland. The collection fills five metal four-drawer, legal-sized filing cases and 70 manuscript boxes, plus many bound pamphlets and other volumes. Estimated to contain over 70,000 items, dating from 1676 to about 1900, it includes the correspondence of the first five Bishops of Maryland and letters by virtually all of the American Bishops consecrated prior to 1880. Associated items, notably the Callister Papers, 1741-1766, and the Goldsborough family papers from "Myrtle Grove," add to its importance. Mr. Garner Ranney is Curator of the Diocesan manuscripts.

This collection complements the Society's holdings. The same names and subjects constantly appear in both collections, and often research in one collection would be incomplete without reference to the other. Now that both are housed in one building, increased scholarly use of the Diocesan Archives is anticipated. Although the collection is concerned primarily with Church affairs, it includes much secular, national and

local historical material, relating to the opening of the West, the country's wars, politics, and social conditions.

When moved to the Society, the card catalog for the Diocesan Manuscripts contained over 73,000 entries. Since then work has been principally concerned with installing and reorganizing the collection, with a view to making still unindexed materials more readily available for research. Accordingly, the card catalog has grown more slowly than in the past, but about 3,000 cards have been added since September. Hundreds of pamphlets concerning Maryland churches and clergymen are currently being cataloged. A census of letters from American Bishops has recently been compiled.

On behalf of the Society, the Library Committee expresses to the Diocese of Maryland warm thanks for making possible the felicitous conjunction of two great manuscript collections.

(b) *Printed Material.* Processing of printed material proceeds, but at a slower pace, chiefly because Miss Hester Rich, Assistant Librarian and Cataloger, has assumed wider responsibilities. Cataloging of current accessions totaled 665 volumes of 519 titles, as against an average of 1,200 titles in previous years. At least 3,000 pamphlets and ephemera collected over the years remain unprocessed. Much has been done in 1967, and over one thousand of the 1966 four thousand total have been treated.

The Society's extensive and valuable collection of sheet music has been the project of Mr. Lester S. Levy. Under his supervision, Mr. David Berger has checked 3,000 unsorted sheets against the existing collection. Mr. Levy is now listing the more important pieces. The Librarian has cataloged 200 early Maryland song books and manuals, some of which are rare.

Mrs. Sidney Painter has continued weeding the periodicals and reorganizing the serials. In 1966-67, 807 volumes were sent to the bindery as against the previous average of 150 per year.

(c) *Graphics.* After Mr. Eader's resignation, Mrs. McCauley assumed the curatorship of all the graphics, which include maps, prints, drawings, photographs, charts, plats, slides and pictures totaling about 100,000 items. She made a thorough study of the needs of the Society and gained tremendous insight from visits to Winterthur and the Library of Congress. A program of conservation has been begun for those items badly in need

of preservation. In time it is hoped that all graphic materials can be so cared for, permitting freer handling as well as increasing their longevity.

Two exhibit cases were made available for displays to acquaint the public with the scope of the graphics holdings. Visitors passing through the reception room viewed with interest the Benjamin H. Latrobe drawings of children and of his White House furniture designs.

The collection of approximately 1,400 glass slides is being put on film for easier access and permanency. Winterthur Museum is now photographing approximately 200 of them and will give the Society a print of each. This division has filled 201 orders for institutions, individuals and publishers, resulting in net receipts of \$964.

The arrangement with Winterthur whereby the Society's picture collection was examined and photographed, caused serious dislocation and required a month of the Curator's time to return the items withdrawn by Winterthur. Copies are now awaited.

The generosity of a member of the Society made possible the photographing of the Benjamin H. Latrobe watercolors and drawings, totaling 455. Negatives and positives in color and black and white, 4" x 5", are being made.

(d) *Genealogy*. With the appointment of a genealogical librarian, the many genealogical researchers are better served. Donations from members and purchases allowed the acquisition of expensive sets and reference books. Mail inquiries have increased, but all are answered promptly.

(e) *Miscellaneous*. The Librarian, ably supported by the staff, organized the Manuscript Society's annual conference in Baltimore. Sessions were held at the Society and in Annapolis. About 150 members visited Baltimore.

During the year the Librarian spoke at meetings on 14 occasions. Mrs. Mary I. Meyer addressed the Maryland Genealogical Society. The Librarian attended meetings of the Bibliographical Society of America, the Manuscript Society, the Grolier Club, and the American Library Association. He was program chairman for the Rare Books Section of A. L. A. and for the Manuscript Society's conference. He visited the historical societies of Pennsylvania, Utah and California, the New Mexico Archives

and the Genealogical Society of the Latter-Day Saints in Salt Lake City. Miss Bayly Marks attended the Southern Historical Association Annual Meeting in Atlanta and visited the Georgia Department of Archives and History and the Virginia Historical Society. Members of the staff also visited Eleutherian Mills and Winterthur.

Miss Anna D. Ward completed a list of known sources of signers of the Oaths of Allegiance. One county's list, Kent, has not been found; otherwise the list is complete. In all, there are about 20,000 cards, and it is hoped that they soon see publication.

Mr. Winton F. Hurley, an authority on currency, has rationalized the Society's collection of colonial notes. Sales and purchases have been made, and the few gaps existing are being filled.

Sumner A. and Dudrea W. Parker Genealogical Contest

The Parker Genealogical Contest attracted another eight genealogical works in 1967. The thoughtfulness of Mrs. Sumner A. Parker in making prizes available is much appreciated, and the genealogical collection has been enriched by numerous entries since the contest's beginning in 1946.

Accessions

During the year 750 lots of material were accessioned, as against 592 in 1966. These have been reported in detail in *Maryland History Notes*.

Rationalization of the Collection

Mr. Edward G. Howard continued work on out-of-scope and duplicate materials, and sales of such materials were extraordinarily successful. A number of pamphlets remain to be examined.

The existence of this sales fund has revitalized the library. Sorely needed equipment has been purchased, and manuscripts and books have been restored when necessary. No materials in the stacks remain exposed. Purchases of much-needed reference and bibliographical works have been made, and a number of rarities, hitherto out of the Society's range, have been acquired. The existence of this fund will also make possible the publication of the *Guide to the Manuscript Collections of the Maryland Historical Society*.

Library Committee

The addition of three bookmen, Messrs. Arthur J. Gutman (Marylandiana), Harry S. Dickey (rare books), and A. Russell Slagle (genealogy), has strengthened the Committee. Progress has been made in all but the rare books division where lack of shelf space and accommodation for other than octavo books has caused concern. With the expansion of the library to the present gallery in the future, it will be possible to house all rarities properly. Following the death of The Honorable John Campbell White, a member of the Library Committee for twelve years, Mrs. White presented \$2,000 in his memory; but further financial assistance is urgently needed.

The Librarian appreciates the enthusiastic manner in which the staff carried on its work through a difficult year. He also records his gratitude to the Director and the Library Committee Chairman, as well as to Mr. Edward G. Howard, Mr. Lester S. Levy, and Mr. Winton F. Hurley.

* * *

This report, prepared by the Librarian, tells the story of what is doubtless the library's most active and effective year. Scarcely can the present library recognize itself. For this the Society owes a great debt to the indefatigable Mr. Filby, and another debt to Mr. Edward Howard of the Library Committee for his long and profitable hours of work on the book collections. His service as acting Chairman during the absence from the country of the undersigned is also a cause for gratitude.

HUNTINGTON WILLIAMS, M.D., *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

During the year 1967 the Publications Committee gave most of its attention to three problems, two old ones, the publication of the *Maryland Archives* and the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, and one new one, the plan to publish the Latrobe Papers.

The new departure with the *Maryland Archives*, to publish a new series of post-revolutionary state documents, is now well in hand. Happily for the enterprise Dr. St. Julien Ravenel Childs has joined the Society's staff with a primary commitment

to prepare the text, and is well started. A subcommittee of the Publications Committee, consisting of Drs. Rhoda Dorsey, Morris Radoff, Richard Walsh, and C. Aubrey Land, Chairman, is in charge.

The *Maryland Historical Magazine* had a good 1967. Unfortunately Dr. Richard Walsh felt so pressed by his duties at Georgetown University that he had to resign the editorship (though he continues with the *Archives* project). His university colleague, Dr. Richard Duncan, has accepted appointment as acting editor for the calendar year 1968. Herewith the Committee expresses its grateful appreciation to Dr. Walsh for his years of productive service to the *Magazine*, and wishes him and Dr. Duncan well in their new duties. Meanwhile at the suggestion of the Committee, the Council of the Society has approved the appointment of a subcommittee on the *Magazine* which will double as an advisory Board of Editors. The members are: Dr. Jack P. Greene, Dr. Aubrey C. Land, Dr. Benjamin Quarles, Dr. Morris L. Radoff, Mr. A. Russell Slagle, and Dr. Rhoda M. Dorsey, Chairman.

Concerning the Latrobe Papers, the Society has been so fortunate as to receive a grant for a "feasibility study" from the National Historical Publications Commission (at the National Archives) and to secure the services of Dr. Paul F. Norton, Chairman of the Department of Art at the University of Massachusetts, to prepare that study. At this writing that study is in advanced preparation. If all goes as expected, Dr. Norton will report that a generous edition of the Benjamin Latrobe Papers is better than feasible, that it is a most promising and practicable scholarly undertaking. After such a report, financing and organizing the project will be in order.

The Committee proposed the publication of one monograph in 1967, but could not act for lack of funds.

CHARLES A. BARKER, *Chairman*

MEMBERSHIP

Following are the membership statistics for 1967:

<i>January 1, 1967</i>	Individual	1795	
	Contributing	310	
	Husband and Wife . .	1009	
	Sustaining	56	
	Donor	20	
	Life	91	
	Patron	4	
			<hr/>
			3285
<i>New members, 1967</i>	Individual	81	
	Contributing	68	
	Husband and Wife . .	82	
	Donor	12	
	Life	1	
			<hr/>
			244
			<hr/>
			3529
<i>Members lost, 1967</i>	Death — Life	1	
	Other	31	
	Resignations	23	
	Lapsed for two years .	86	
			<hr/>
			141
			<hr/>
<i>December 31, 1967</i>	NET TOTAL		3388

Categories of membership:

Individual	1736
Contributing	378
Husband and Wife . .	1091
Sustaining	56
Donor	32
Life	91
Patron	4
	<hr/>
TOTAL	3388

Now that the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building has been occupied and the Society can resume its full schedule of activities, the Committee plans the preparation of a promotional pamphlet and the inauguration of a campaign for additional members.

CHARLES P. CRANE, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON ADDRESSES

Because of problems relating to the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, the customary series of afternoon lectures on arts and crafts was not given. In 1968 the series will be resumed on an expanded scale.

Other meetings were held as follows:

January 9—Joint meeting with the Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities at the Great Hall of Emmanuel Church. Colonel Randle B. Truett spoke on "The Restoration of Ford's Theatre, Washington, D.C."

February 13—Annual Meeting, also at Emmanuel Church. Officers and members of standing committees were elected for the coming year and the Constitution was amended to provide for the establishment of an Executive Committee.

March 20—Regular membership meeting, also at Emmanuel Church. Mrs. Frank E. Klapthor, Assistant Curator, Division of Political History, Smithsonian Institution, gave a slide-illustrated talk on "Presidential China."

June 16—The Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building was opened from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. for inspection by members and friends of the Society.

October 15—The Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building was dedicated. The main speaker was Dr. Lincoln Gordon, President of Johns Hopkins University.

December 11—Regular membership meeting. Dr. Ralph Klein, Assistant Dean, University of Maryland, gave an address entitled "Revolution in Higher Education: Maryland's Overseas Program."

The Society records its gratitude to Emmanuel Church for

generously allowing it to meet in the Great Hall. By action of the Council on December 21, this committee was abolished.

H. R. M.

COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH OTHER SOCIETIES

During the year the following groups met at the Society on one or more occasions: Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities; National Society, Colonial Dames in the State of Maryland; Woman's Eastern Shore Society; Civil War Union Room Committee; Confederate Room Committee of the United Daughters of the Confederacy; Society of the *Ark* and the *Dove*; Society of the Cincinnati of Maryland; Daughters of the American Revolution; Daughters of the Revolution; Manuscript Society; Baltimore Bibliophiles; Reference Services Division, American Library Association; and Special Libraries Association, Baltimore Chapter.

Perhaps the most important evidence of state cooperation was the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Association of Historical Societies in Maryland which met at the Society on September 30, with 142 persons representing 28 different organizations. Mr. P. W. Filby, Librarian and Assistant Director of the Society, led a panel discussion on "The Care and Preservation of Manuscripts"; Mr. William V. Elder III, Curator of Decorative Arts, Baltimore Museum of Art, presided over a similar group which discussed "The Care and Preservation of Furniture"; while Mr. Peter Michaels, Associate Conservator, Walters Art Gallery, discussed "The Care and Preservation of Paintings." Following lunch Dr. William Lloyd Fox, Professor of History at Montgomery Junior College, talked on "What Needs to be Written in Maryland History." During the afternoon, in chartered buses the group visited the recently restored Carroll-Caton House, The Star-Spangled Banner Flag House, and Fort McHenry. The 1968 conference will be held on September 28 in Rockville as guests of the Montgomery County Historical Society.

By action of the Council on December 21, this committee was abolished.

H. R. M.

COMMITTEE ON THE MARITIME COLLECTION

During 1967 the Committee did not meet formally, but various members performed much work on the collection which was moved to new and larger quarters in the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building. Numerous display cases were purchased. The planning and preparation of exhibits were accomplished almost entirely by Mr. R. Hammond Gibson, and the Chairman continued work on his several maritime files relating to the port of Baltimore and the Chesapeake Bay. Sincere gratitude goes again to Mr. and Mrs. Marion V. Brewington for their third gift of \$1,000 to be expended for the good of the collection.

Acquisitions have been acknowledged in *Maryland History Notes* as received.

RICHARD H. RANDALL, *Chairman*

THOMAS AND HUGG MEMORIAL
BUILDING COMMITTEE

As of October 1, the Society accepted the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, subject to a guarantee against defects until October 1, 1968. At that time the Chairman will request that the Committee be dissolved and that he be relieved of his responsibilities.

ABBOTT L. PENNIMAN, JR., *Chairman*

WOMEN'S COMMITTEE

This year marked a milestone for the Society as well as for the Women's Committee. We are finally in the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building.

Meanwhile the Committee continues its activities. Mrs. Bourne has begun illustrations for Mrs. Earle's pamphlet on costumes which the Committee will sponsor; Miss Ingle has completed the rehabilitation of the Society's collection of dolls and doll clothing; Mrs. Bourne has taken over the clipping of newspapers from Mrs. Newcomer; and, thanks to Mrs. Gibbs, the scrapbook is up to date and the basic furniture for the staff lounge has been purchased. The first-aid room will be equipped by Mrs. Hyde.

Volunteers from the Committee acted as hostesses during the preview of the new building on June 16, and acted as registrars at the September meeting of the Association of Historical Societies of Maryland. Volunteers also acted as hostesses and guides when a group of over 200 ladies from a local industrial plant visited the Society. Thanks go to all who, on short notice, helped to address 3,000 invitations for the dedication of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building on October 15.

The problem of curtains for the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Room has been ably handled with the help of Mr. Cousins of the Chambers Company by Mesdames Riepe, Riggs and Gibbs. The same subcommittee continues to select curtains for the exhibition rooms flanking the memorial room.

The ladies' withdrawing room was decorated by Mrs. Williams and Mrs. Swarm of the staff. Mrs. Buck has completed equipping the staff kitchen.

To everyone who provided greens and helped to decorate both buildings at Christmas go my hearty thanks. The Committee had the pleasure of receiving a monetary gift from the Amateur Garden Club to be used for proposed work in the garden.

None of the above accomplishments could have been carried to completion without the full cooperation of the Committee—many thanks.

KATHERINE S. SYMINGTON, *Chairman*

THE SEMINAR IN MARYLAND HISTORY

Because of the illness and later death of Dr. Kent Roberts Greenfield, Chairman and founder of the Seminar in Maryland History, the group did not meet during the year. The loss of Dr. Greenfield—one of the most interested and active members of the Council—is a heavy blow to the Society.

By action of the Council at the December meeting, this committee was merged with the Committee on Publications from which it had been created.

H. R. M.

\$

\$

\$

\$

Available:

\$

HIGH-DIVIDEND SAVINGS CERTIFICATES

\$

in denominations of \$12,000 and up, earning the
HIGHEST permissible rate by the Federal Home
Loan Bank

and

\$3,000 and up, also earning a very high rate. (Addi-
tions may be made in multiples of \$1,000.)

The more flexible passbook savings accounts to
which smaller sums may be added or withdrawn
at will, also earn a very HIGH rate (including
that *extra* $\frac{1}{4}\%$ per annum).

For full particulars, call LE. 9-1313 or HO. 5-5445.

FRATERNITY FEDERAL *Savings*

AND LOAN ASSOCIATION

Main Office:
764-770

Washington Blvd.
Balto. Md. 21203

Branch:

Normandy Shopping Center
Route 40 West
Ellicott City, Md.



Chartered, supervised by the Federal
Home Loan Bank; INSURED to
\$15,000 by the Federal Savings
and Loan Insurance Corp.,
GOVT. Agencies =
DOUBLY SAFE!

- ★ Postage-FREE SAVE-by-MAIL Service — CER-
TIFICATES may be purchased by mail
- ★ DRIVE-UP Windows—main office (at-the-door
PARKING LOTS at both offices)
- ★ Economical SAFE DEPOSIT BOXES—both offices

IN 1908_____

when we reached the age of 29

The first collection of poems by James Ryder Randall, "Maryland! My Maryland!" and Other Poems," was published in Baltimore.—March 28.

Eight newly-chosen bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church were consecrated in Baltimore.—May 31.

Henry Phipps gave \$500,000 to the Johns Hopkins Hospital and announced plans for a psychiatric clinic.—May 30.

In 1965_____


... we occupied our new office and warehouse especially constructed to utilize the most modern equipment and techniques.

MOVING—We are Maryland's largest agent for Allied Van Lines, with the experienced personnel and facilities for any moving job—local or long distance. Our expert packers prepare anything from household furnishings to precious art treasures for safe handling in transport or in storage, using customized containers and new, clean packing material.

STORAGE—Our especially designed one-level storage warehouse reduces handling to a minimum. All goods are packed into room-size portable containers, sealed against light, dust or moisture and stored in the sprinkler-protected, fireproof building that permits lowest possible insurance rate.

Our motto is: "WE CARE"

Agent for Allied Van Lines, the World's Largest Moving Organization

Monumental-
 **Security STORAGE CO.**

3006 Druid Park Drive, Baltimore, Md. 21215
Phone 664-1664

Salisbury, Md. Office & Warehouse: 815 Benny St.
Phone: PI 9-7117

Serving Maryland and the Nation Since 1879

Available July, 1968:

The
Manuscript Collections
of the
Maryland Historical Society

A guide to the manuscripts in the Maryland Historical Society, describing over 1700 collections, comprising approximately 1,000,000 items, with subject, name and place index.

About 400 pp.

\$15.00

Plus 35¢ postage, etc.;
tax, if applicable, 3%

***Order from:* MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY**
201 W. Monument St
Baltimore, Md. 21201

PUBLICATIONS

Studies in Maryland History

His Lordship's Patronage: Offices of Profit in Colonial Maryland.

By Donnell M. Owings. 1953 \$ 6.00

Texts and References for School Use

The War of 1812 On The Chesapeake Bay. Illustrated paperback.

By Gilbert Byron, 1964 \$ 2.00

My Maryland. By Kaessmann, Manakee and Wheeler. History of Maryland, Revised edition

\$ 4.50

The Star-Spangled Banner. Illustrated booklet. Description of the writing of our National Anthem by Francis Scott Key

\$.50

Indians of Early Maryland. By Harold R. Manakee. 1959

\$ 1.80

Maryland in the Civil War. By Harold R. Manakee. 1961 . . .

\$ 4.50

Wheeler Leaflets on Maryland History. (24 titles) . . . each

\$.10

Miscellaneous

A History of the University of Maryland. By George H. Callcott. Illustrated. 1966.

\$ 7.50

Quakers in the Founding of Anne Arundel County, Maryland.

By J. Reaney Kelly. Illustrated. 1963

\$ 5.50

The Maryland Press, 1777-1790. By Joseph T. Wheeler. 1938 . .

\$ 4.00

History of Queen Anne's County. By Frederic Emory. 1950 . . .

\$ 7.50

From Mill Wheel to Plowshare By Julia A. Drake and J. R. Orndorff. Orndorff Genealogy. Illustrated. 1938

\$ 5.00

Chesapeake Bay Sailing Craft. By M. V. Brewington. Illustrated pamphlet

\$.50

Semmes and Kindred Families. By Harry Wright Newman. 1956

\$10.00

The Hollyday and Related Families of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. By James Bordley, Jr., M.D. 1962

\$10.00

The Regimental Colors of the 175th Infantry (Fifth Maryland).

By H. R. Manakee and Col. Roger S. Whiteford. 1959

\$ 2.00

World War II

Maryland in World War II: Vol. I, Military Participation, 1950; Vol. II, Industry and Agriculture, 1951; Vol. IV, Gold Star

Honor Roll, 1956. H. R. Manakee, comp. each

\$ 3.25

History of the 110th Field Artillery, with Sketches of Related Units.

By Col. John P. Cooper, Jr. Illustrated. 1953

\$ 5.00

Maryland in World War II—Register of Service Personnel, 5 vols. each

\$20.00

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

201 W. Mounment Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Postage and tax,
if applicable, extra.

AN ILLUSTRATED GENEALOGY
of
THE COUNTIES OF MARYLAND
AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AS A GUIDE TO LOCATING RECORDS

by
MARY ROSS BROWN

For anyone interested in Maryland or the District of Columbia, particularly the historian, teacher and genealogist, this is a useful work.

\$4.00 postpaid

Available at
the Society

**TONGUE, BROOKS
& COMPANY**

I N S U R A N C E

Since 1898

— • —
**213 ST. PAUL PLACE
BALTIMORE**

**TRADITIONAL
FURNITURE**

*From America's outstanding
sources . . . in wide open
stock selection.*

Our workroom offers complete restoration service . . . cabinetwork, refinishing and reupholstering.

FALLON & HELLEN
11 and 13 W. Mulberry St.
Baltimore, Md. 21201
LExington 9-3345

Coins, Gold Coins, Obsolete Paper Currency and

Political Items Urgently Needed.

MASON-DIXON COIN EXCHANGE

THOS. P. WARFIELD, Member, Professional Numismatic Guild, Inc.

208 W. Saratoga St., Baltimore, Md. 21201

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

PHOTOGRAPHY

Since 1878

HUGHES CO.

Copy and Restoration Work a Specialty.

Black and White or color.

Phone: 889-5540

C. GAITHER SCOTT

115 E. 25th Street

Baltimore, Md. 21218

FAMILY COAT OF ARMS

A Symbol Of Your Family's Heritage From The Proud Past

Handpainted In Oils In Full Heraldic Colors — Size $11\frac{1}{2} \times 14\frac{1}{2}$ — \$15.00

Research When Necessary

ANNA DORSEY LINDER

PINES OF HOCKLEY

166 Defense Highway

Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Phone: 263-3384

PLUMBING—HEATING—AIR CONDITIONING

M. NELSON BARNES & SONS, INC.

Established 1909 Phone: 252-4313 2011 Greenspring Drive, Timonium

BOOKBINDING

JOSEPH RUZICKA, INC.

TU 9-7847 — TU 9-5095

3200 Elm Avenue (11)

Magazines, Books & Records

Restoration of Rare Volumes
